This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER,

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION,

DEVOTED TO

PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY;

CONDUCTED BY

Alexander Campbell.

NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

I saw another messenger flying through the midst of heaven, having everlasting good news to proclaim to the inhabitants of the earth, even to every nation, and tribe, and tongue, and people; saying with a loud voice—Fear God, and give glory to him, for the hour of his judgments is come; and worship him who made heaven, and earth, and sea, and the fountains of water. JOHN.

Great is the truth, and mighty above all things, and will prevail.

NEW SERIES—VOL. IV.

BETHANY, VA.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY A. CAMPBELL.

1840.

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
86651
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS.
1897.

THE ASTOR LIBRARY
NY

PREFACE.

YEARS roll on: the pulse of Time never ceases: the wheels of Nature carry down all the living with a constant and rapid motion. We are born, we live, we die, and are forgotten amidst the bustle of coming years. We are now the actors—the *dramatis personæ* on the stage of time. Each one plays his part, and retires behind the curtains of death. But the sequel is on another theatre, before other spectators and auditors. The plaudits and the hissings are eternal. We play for crowns and kingdoms—for deathless fame and imperishable treasures. A heaven is lost, or a heaven is won at the close of the last act.

There are many subordinate parts in the great drama of human existence. There are also very conspicuous and high places—great responsibilities—immense prizes—while every one has his own destiny at stake, and all are to be rewarded according to their works.

Such reflections crowd upon us on the commencement of a new volume in the progress of a great revolution—a reformation—a change for the better in the ecclesiastic and moral relations and positions of society. We feel our obligations and responsibilities to be very great. The cause on hand is above all causes now before the bar of public opinion. It demands all our powers—it calls for all our resources.—The question is variously propounded; but the substance is, *Who shall rule in Zion?*—Jesus or the Pope?—Christ or Antichrist?—the twelve Apostles or twelve hundred Synods and Councils?—the New Testament or a human Creed?—the Word of the Lord or the Opinions of Men?—Union or Schism?—Catholicity or Sectarianism?—one Lord, one faith, one baptism, or three Lords, three faiths, and three baptisms?

We may change the terms, the propositions, the questions; but the real points in issue cannot be changed. The issue is between—whether the church began in Jerusalem or in Rome—whether the acts of the Apostles, or the acts of four or seven general Councils, shall be first, last, or midst in deciding what the gospel is—what the gospel ministry, the gospel church, the gospel salvation, and the gospel institutions are.

A hundred sects, or even two, cannot be right: all may, however, be wrong. All, indeed, are wrong that are built on any thing but the one foundation of Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself the chief corner stone. *There cannot be two houses built upon the same foundation.* There is but one true, visible, real church of Christ on earth. Houses are not branches of a house; neither are Roman, Greek, or Protestant parties *branches* of Christ's church. There may be partial followers of Christ in all parties; but this will not make the parties Christian churches. Republicans in England, France, and Spain will

not make those countries Republics. Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, &c. &c. have among them many good men—many who follow Christ as far as those systems will permit men to follow Christ; but none of them being Christ's church, will permit its members to follow Christ fully. A person can practise and enjoy republicanism only in a Republic. Christ's religion can only be preached and enjoyed in Christ's own church.

Our volumes, one and all, prosecute the demolition of all sectarism—the union of all God's people, upon God's own foundation—the conversion of the world to the original and true gospel of Christ—the setting up of the ancient institutions of Christ for the reasons, purposes and objects assigned by the Apostles.

The cause of education becomes a more and more interesting object in pursuance of this plan. We must begin at the nursery. We must have family, school, college, and church education, adapted to the entire physical, intellectual, moral and religious constitution of man. Of these the first in time, place and importance, is the domestic and family training. We have been dreaming for ages, and are only just now awaking to the importance of education—not merely to its importance, but to the *rationale*—the philosophy of the thing called Education.

To this subject, as essentially connected with the speed and progress of the current reformation, a more full and marked attention shall be paid. An uneducated person is not competent to the full display of Christian excellence—to the full manifestation of Christian character. No person is well educated—is properly taught or trained, that is not a Christian. But we cannot fashion human nature but in the soft clay of its infancy and childhood—'As the twig is bent the tree's inclin'd.'

A few lessons on the training of households—on the Christian nurture, will, in the form of examples, be submitted in the present volume, in the style of 'Family Conversations in the Domestic Circle.' But in this age of frailty in promises, we find it most prudent to promise little. It is, indeed, fast passing into a proverb, "Blessed is he that expecteth nothing, for he shall never be disappointed;" and "Happy is he who maketh no promises, for then he is not likely to be a covenant-breaker." We shall, however, endeavor to hold on our way, and to labor honorably and assiduously in the prosecution of the great objects so long and so often overtured to our contemporaries.—And may grace, mercy, and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ, be multiplied to every one who sincerely and faithfully labors with us, by word or action, in this blest cause of holy truth and of human redemption!

A. CAMPBELL.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

NEW SERIES.

VOLUME IV.——NUMBER I.

BETHANY, VA. *JANUARY*, 1840.

BETHEL;

OR,

THE CHRISTIAN'S HOUSE.

THE superabundance of grace displayed in the Christian system is not likely to be appreciated, much less exaggerated, in this cold and selfish and sensual age. It would sometimes seem to me as though not one of a thousand in the whole army of the church militant, did realize the amount of privilege, of wealth and honor guarantied to those in covenant with the Lord Messiah. The state and estate are, it would seem, alike unknown and unknowable, to the plodding votaries of man-made systems of devotion—seekers of religion—apprenticed converts—the speculative catechumenoi of sectarian schools.

The religion of the Lord Messiah is indeed a *personal* affair—a *spiritual* concern—a soul-absorbing, subduing, ennobling institution. The subject and the object are persons, not things—not doctrines, not theories, not forms; but living, thinking, talking, acting agents. The elements of this celestial invention are one person believing, trusting in, loving, admiring, rejoicing in, and obeying another person. It is the intercourse, the commerce, the converse, the intimacies, the communings and communications of two kindred minds of very unequal standing—of very dissimilar rank and dignity. It is a sinful creature pardoned, reconciled, sanctified, adopted, saved, in covenant with the supreme intelligence, the uncreated God, as appearing in the person and character of the *incarnate* WORD, the only begotten Son of God.

The disparity of their rank greatly heightens the confidence, affection, and esteem of the humbler party, and delights the superior in

affording a wider and a deeper channel for the benignant communications of his condescending love. A league of truer, purer, and more enduring amity can always be formed and maintained between a magnanimous and generous Prince and his own reconciled subjects, than between Princes of equal rank and independence. The forest oak that kindly raises from the ground the humble vine, receives not only its fond embraces for the help and protection which it affords, but it is also adorned by the beauty of its foliage, as well as honored by the music and the melody which its flowers, its odors, and its fruits allure to its branches.

No co-partnery on earth like marriage, and yet this is but a feeble type of an eternal union of all interests between the Bridegroom of heaven and his earthly spouse. He gave himself for, and then transfers himself to his bride; and thus by an everlasting covenant the parties are united in an identity of interests, honors, and enjoyments commensurate with all the powers of blessing and being blessed, possessed by the contracting parties. Did Christians realize all this, how different would be their earthly career from what it too often is. Their hearts would be temples for the Spirit of Holiness, and their houses Bethels for the God of Jacob.

By a recurrence to the patriarchal age, to the time of Jacob, we shall find the origin of *Bethels*. This renowned patriarch of eternal fame, whose new name *Israel* is transferred to all the elect of God, and whose first name is a part of God's own memorial to the end of all generations, had commenced his earthly pilgrimage; and with the blessing of his father upon his head, and the prayers of his mother, he had set out to form an alliance with the remnant of the faithful in the motherland of his pious ancestors.

On the first night of his pilgrimage he had the celebrated vision of the ladder suspended from the threshold of heaven to the rocky pillow on which, amidst the hazle thicket, he slept so sweetly and dreamed so truly, while his father's and grand-father's God spoke to him of unborn ages, and promised to be with him in every place whither he went, or in which he waked or slept during his whole peregrinations, until his return to the covenanted land. It was then the fear and awe of the heavenly Majesty constrained these words—"How dreadful is this place: this is none other but *the house of God*:* this is the gate of heaven." When the patriarch rose up early in the morning he took the stone on which he had slept, and setting it up for a monumental pillar, he anointed it with oil, and called the place *Bethel*. There he made his covenant with God, and solemnly vowed allegiance and devotion to him, on the the terms of an immutable covenant.

* *Beth El* is the Hebrew for *the house of God*.

Now it occurs to us that what was true of Israel is still true—that all the Israel of God are a covenanted people—that the God of Jacob is still their refuge, and the Holy One of Israel is yet their King. Therefore we should still build an altar and rear a pillar to his name. Every Christian dwelling should still have its family altar, and its monumental record of what God has said and done. If, indeed, as the Apostles say, the Christian people are, severally and collectively, "*a habitation* of God through the Spirit," "a holy temple," "a spiritual house"—then I ask, Should not their dwellings be houses of prayer and of song, and in them "be heard the melody of praise" continually?

We come, then, directly to the point, and affirm it as our conviction that all Christian dwellings should be *Bethels*—houses consecrated to God, in which his word should be read, his praises sung, and his name invoked on all the days of the year. Wherever the people of God under the first dispensation pitched their tents, they erected their altars to the Lord. Under the second dispensation they were, by divine commandment, daily to read or teach the word of God to their families. Then it became a proverb, that "the voice of rejoicing and salvation is in the tabernacles of the righteous."*

May we not then say to the righteous under the third dispensation, "Be glad in the Lord, and rejoice, ye righteous, and shout for joy, all you that are upright in heart:"—"for praise is comely for the upright." "Thy statutes," said a Jewish king, "have been my songs in the house of my pilgrimage;" and will not a Christian father say as much of himself and his house as a Jewish king? Are not Christian householders as much bound by divine authority to bring up their families for the Lord—to nurture and train them for the royal family of heaven! And what son of God is there who has a heart, a tongue, and a Bible—children and servants under his care, and will not anoint his pillar, erect his altar, and worship the Lord constantly in his family? Thus teaching his children by his example how much he loves and delights in God, and with what pure affection and tender love he seeks their moral excellence and their eternal life.

Needs it be proved that those children who mourn and even receive the parental benedictions along with their stated lessons from God's own book, have brighter evidence not only of the piety and godly sincerity of their parents, but also of their parental tenderness and affection! What knowledge or belief can the sons and daughters of prayerless professors have of the piety or Christian benevolence of their parents? Surely they afford them no unequivocal demonstrations of genuine tenderness, no convincing proof of unsophisticated affec-

* Psalm cxviii. 15.

tion, who seldom or never bow the knee with them, and invoke in their own language the blessings of God upon their sons and daughters. Natural or animal affection for their offspring they may have; so have inferior animals. But where, I ask, are the proofs of that heaven-born Christian affection and feeling that looks to the true and eternal interests and honors of our offspring! It cannot be seen, and as little can it be imagined, in the absence of those demonstrations of parental piety.

The two branches of religion are piety and humanity. These, in all their developments towards Creator and fellow-creature, contain the whole. They are visible, sensible, and demonstrable things. They are to each other in equal ratios—as cause and effect: the more of the one, the more of the other. Theories, or doctrinal views of these things, are not the things themselves. We want to see the things, the effects, the fruits of piety more fully displayed in our generation, and more especially amongst those of our brethren who certainly are standing on higher and holier ground than other professors; and from whom all men expect not merely a more rational, a more scriptural theory; but a purer, a holier, a more divine and heavenly practice. Every one in our ranks is, by profession, a saint—a "partaker of the heavenly calling;" and from such all men look for a more scriptural piety, a more perfect morality than can be developed or displayed under a party dispensation of opinionism and sectarism.

On this account, brethren, I have made my New Year's first offering to the press consist of a few plain practical remarks and reminiscences on the subject of consecrating all our dwellings into Bethels—of erecting an altar in every Christian family, upon which we shall constantly offer our morning and evening sacrifices to the Lord. This is the practice of all the exemplary members of our churches in the whole ranks of our profession, so far as known to me. I have, however, heard of some professors very remiss in this all-important service; and for their sakes it is our duty to present this free-will offering as the first fruits of the Year 1840.

Family instruction and social prayer are as indispensable means of family salvation as any other means to any other desirable ends in a moral system. Besides, what pleasure does it afford all householders and heads of families to believe that the angel of the Lord encamps around their dwellings, and that their places of repose are houses consecrated to the Lord in which he deigns to dwell. This persuasion sweetens all social and domestic enjoyments, and greatly elevates the dignity and moral excellence of all the inmates of such consecrated homes. No person who has long lived in a Bethel can ever after relish the tabernacles of ungodly men. Some instructions for those

about to consecrate their dwellings into habitations of piety and righteousness will be found in the next and subsequent articles under the same title. A. C.

FAMILY CULTURE.

CONVERSATIONS AT THE CARLTON HOUSE.

INTRODUCTION TO THE FAMILY CIRCLE.

To foretell the fortune of a family with unerring certainty, is not more difficult than to estimate how much good, present and future—direct and indirect, may be achieved in any neighborhood by only one person of great energy of character, of superior intelligence and moral worth, who sincerely and devoutly undertakes the improvement of society. The excellent Olympas, long resident and master of the Carlton House, in Carmel Place, and his beloved Julia are yet living monuments of the great moral force of well disciplined minds, energetically and affectionately employed in advancing the religious and moral conditions of human existence. Their philanthropy was rational, pure, and fervent; and sought the most natural and capacious channels through which to communicate its blessings to society. While their commiserations and sympathies embraced the Turk, the Jew, and the Indian, they wasted not their time nor their substance in the formation of Utopian schemes for their conversion; but supremely employed their energies in family and neighborhood advancement in the paths of literature, religion, and morality. They felt the impulses of heavenly charity to be warmest and strongest for those at home; and therefore superlatively sought the moral excellence and eternal salvation of their children, relatives, and neighbors. Yet did they not look with a cold indifference on the destitute and wretched of other climes and languages; but, reversing the policy of some of their more popular compeers, they contributed their pence to Hindostan and spent their pounds at home.

But their domestic administration and manner of disciplining and training their own immediate family, is that which at this time most especially interests us, because it very happily exemplifies, in an intelligible and practical form, those principles and rules of family culture which both our theory and experience would commend to those who are supremely devoted to the eternal honor and happiness of their own dear households. To further our aims and wishes we shall be at some

pains to give in detail a few of those lessons in which we had the pleasure to participate under their consecrated roof, around the family altar, at the morning and evening hour of domestic instruction and social prayer.

The family was large, consisting of nine children, natural and adopted, with some half dozen of domestics, of different ages. All were arranged in classes according to their ages and capacities. The first consisted of three, under 7 years old; the second of four, under 14; and all the rest made up the third class. All that could fluently read, with book in hand sat round the room, and in turn read their several portions of the daily lesson. After the reading of one or two chapters, as the case might be, a free conversation ensued in the form of question and answer, frequently interspersed with practical views and remarks adapted to the capacity of all present, and animated with pious emotions and moral sentiments, fitted to imbue the minds of all with the fear and love of God, and to infix in the youthful heart the solid and enduring principles of pure religion and Christian righteousness.

The morning hour, from 6 to 7, thus became an intellectual and moral feast—a spiritual breakfast of the most refreshing and invigorating efficacy to us all. The plan in one important feature soon impresed itself upon my admiration. The infant class, as I may call that composed of those from 5 to 7, was exercised primarily upon the simple facts in the lesson, while the second class explained them; and the third drew the inferences and deduced the practical bearings of the subject as it applied to themselves and society at present.

Another very cardinal view of the whole exhibition immediately arrested my attention. Olympas, instead of calling upon his family to attend family worship, was accustomed to assemble his household to the morning and evening lesson. Family instruction, rather than family worship, was the prominent idea. True, indeed, the praises of God were frequently sung, and prayer and thanksgiving were always offered at the close of the lesson; but as instruction extended to all present, and only a part could properly unite in the worship of God, it was much more apposite to denominate it family teaching than family worship.

Apart from its religious and moral character and influences, contemplated as a literary and intellectual affair—as purely educational in the common acceptance of the term, it was nearly equal to a common school course. Two hours per day, well and faithfully applied in this way, gave to the whole household of Olympas a literary and intellectual superiority over every other family in the neighborhood who enjoyed in every other respect the same educational advantages.

Hence it was usual for Susan, James, and Henry, of the junior class, to be foremost in the Sunday school—foremost in the primary school—as it was for William and Mary, Edward and Eliza, of the second class, to gain all the honors in all the classes at the common and high schools of Carmel city. The domestics of the Carlton House were a sort of aristocracy for intelligence and respectability among their co-ordinates in profession—among all their compeers who attended at the Carlton church. But it would be impossible for any one often to visit this consecrated family—the Carlton Bethel, and not to anticipate such fruits from a system of instruction and moral government so admirably adapted to all the exigencies of humanity in the morning time of its existence. The pre-eminence mentioned was but the proper fruit, the genuine effects of a system of training in perfect harmony with the conditions and wants of human nature.

We can only furnish a few conversations of the many we have had the pleasure to hear during our frequent sojournings under this hospitable roof. These are intended as specimens of the plan which we would most affectionately recommend to all Christian parents who have in their hands the immense responsibilities of rearing a family for the Lord.

CONVERSATION I.

Monday morning, 6 o'clock, being a second reading of the two first chapters of Genesis, containing 52 verses, eleven persons read five verses each, in rotation. After a distinct enunciation of these chapters, Olympas interrogated the junior class in the following manner:—

Tell me, Susan, who created the heavens and the earth?

Susan. GOD; which, as you told me, means the GOOD BEING.

When, James, did God create the heavens and the earth?

James. "In the beginning."

In the beginning of what, Henry?

Henry. In the beginning of time.

And what, Susan, was before the beginning of time?

Susan. GOD.

Were the heavens and the earth, James, both created at the same time?

James. They were both created *in the beginning*.

And where, Henry, did God dwell before the heavens and the earth were made?

Henry. I cannot tell.

Can any of you tell?

William. Moses does not tell us; but one of the books says, he dwells in Eternity.

Which of the holy scribes says this?

William. Isaiah calls him "the High and Holy One who inhabiteth eternity."

Olympas. Observe, then, that time is no part of eternity: for as in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth, the heavens and the earth are the beginning of time. We would then say that God created time by creating the heavens and the earth. In how many days, Henry, did God create the heavens and the earth?

Henry. In six days.

What was created the first day?

Susan. Light, which God called *day*.

And who created *darkness*, Susan?

Susan. I do not know; but I know what God *called* it. He called it *night*.

And what made the first day, James?

James. "The evening and the morning made the first day."

Then was not darkness between the evening and the morning, William?

William. It was. Still light is called day; for we have to count darkness in time, and include a portion of it with light, in counting events; and thus evening, night, and morning are computed as one day.

Olympas. You mean, that while day means light, in *time* it denotes both a portion of light and darkness.

William. Yes; in computing the week we have to count darkness as a portion of time, and make seven days and seven nights a week.

Olympas. Mary, can you tell what darkness is?

Mary. It was not created, and is therefore nothing.

Olympas. It is, indeed, no substance; and therefore was not properly created. But it is spoken of as a thing, and it is figuratively said to be created. God says, "I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace, and create evil: I the Lord do all these things." But he creates darkness by removing the light; for darkness is but the privation of light. Do you think, Edward, that light is a substance?

Edward. It strikes my eye with force, and sometimes with pain, which darkness never does; and is therefore a substance.

Olympas. Can you, Eliza, recollect any reference made to the creation of light in the New Testament.

Eliza. Paul, I think, says that "God commanded the light to shine out of darkness."

William. I read in Plato, or some other book, that "light is the shadow of God."

Olympas. But neither Plato, nor the poets, are of any authority here

A beautiful saying and a true saying are not identical. Some have thought that the original term AUR, which represents both *fire* in general, and lightning or electricity, here refers more to the *matter of light* than to the display of it, because the luminaries were not made till the fourth day; but this to you is more curious than edifying. Tell me, James, what was done on the second day?

James. God made the firmament on the second day.

Olympas. Nothing else, Susan?

Susan. Yes, he made the waters also, and separated them into two parts.

Olympas. We are not told that he created the waters on the second day. He only separated them by the firmament. Can you, William, explain what the firmament is?

William. God called it *heaven;* and it would seem as if it were the place where the stars are fixed.

Olympas. The firmament here spoken of, being placed between waters, can only indicate the expanse called the atmosphere, in which we live and in which the birds fly: hence the birds are said to fly in the midst of heaven. The waters floating in the clouds, and in form of vapors through the atmosphere. are said to be separated from those on the earth.

Edward. Father, will you please tell us when the waters were created? They were not created on the first day, nor on the second day, and yet they are spoken of as existing when the expanse or air was created.

Olympas. Neither the waters nor the earth are included in the details of the six days. First of all, God created *the substance* of the heavens and the earth. And before the details of creation are given we learn that "the earth was without form and void," or one confused mass of land, water, and all other things; over which darkness presided, and on which "the Spirit of God moved." Out of this heterogeneous mass of discordant elements, he first created light; and on the second day he created air: and having separated light and darkness, the waters above and beneath the atmosphere, he made a second pause, or completed a second day. And what, Henry, did God create on the third day?

Henry. He said, "Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit tree yielding fruit after its kind." He covered the earth with grass, and herbs, and trees.

Olympas. But was there not before this a farther separation of the waters, Susan?

Susan. He separated on the first day light from darkness; on the second he separated the waters above and beneath the firmament; and

on the third he again separated the waters from the land; then he clothed the earth with plants and trees.

Olympas. What did he call the dry land, when separated, and the waters when gathered together?

James. He called the dry land *earth*, and the gathered waters *seas.*

Olympas. What was created on the fourth day?

Susan. The sun, moon, and stars. These luminaries were placed in the firmament of the heaven.

Olympas. For what purpose were these so placed?

William. To divide the day from the night—for signs, for seasons, for days, and for years.

Olympas. Can any of you explain these *signs* and *seasons* for which so many luminaries were placed in the upper firmament, or in the heavens?

Edward. You told us, when going through Genesis the first time, that *signs* mean tokens; and certainly they are tokens of God's care and goodness, of his wisdom and power, as exercised for us. They also make seasons for labor and for worship; and then we count on time by the motion and position of these luminaries.

Olympas. What was created the fifth day?

Eliza. Fish and fowl.

Olympas. Whence were the fowls formed?

Mary. From the waters. Fish and fowl were formed from the same element.

Olympas. Were they only water fowls, or were all sorts of birds formed out of the water?

Mary, All sorts of fowls that fly in the open firmament of heaven.

Olympas. This, I presume, is the cause of that peculiar knowledge of the humid changes in the weather, for which all manner of winged fowls are so remarkable. Does any of you remember the remarks made about a year ago on the waters bringing forth abundantly?

Thomas Dilworth. You said that the waters were infinitely prolific of life—that so many as 30,000 animalcules were discovered in one drop. You also said that the fecundity of fish transcended any thing on the earth or in the air. A carp, you said, laid 20,000 eggs, and a codfish about 10,000,000. Thus the sea is capable of sustaining many more individuals than the earth. God blessed the fish, saying, "Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas."

Olympas. And whatr emained for the sixth day?

Susan. On the sixth day he created all the inhabitants of the earth—beasts, cattle, reptiles—every thing that liveth and moveth upon the earth; and, last of all, man and woman.

Olympas. Reuben Thom, can you name the different creative acts in order?

Reuben. I will try, sir. 1st. The substance of the heavens and the earth. 2d. Light. 3d. The vast expanses, the atmosphere, and the ethereal regions. 4th. The vegetable kingdom. 5th. The luminaries of heaven. 6th. The fowl and the fish. 7th. The animal kingdom that belongs particularly to the earth.

Olympas. Let me propose this matter in another form: How many distinct commands did God give in all the details of creation? Can you inform us, John?

John. I find ten distinct imperatives. 1st. Let there be light. 2d. Let there be firmament. 3d. Let the waters be gathered together. 4th. Let the dry land appear. 5th. Let the earth bring forth grass. &c. 6th. Let there be luminaries in the heavens. 7th. Let the waters bring forth abundantly. 8th. Let the earth bring forth living creatures. 9th. Let us make man. 10th. Let him have dominion.

Olympas. Observe especially the order of creation. It is as perfect as the creation itself. Order has respect to the nature and relations of things as regards cause, effect, mechanical force, time, place, circumstance. The creation of the materials is naturally first. Hence the substance of the universe was first made. Out of this mass light is first formed, because of the unsuitableness of darkness to a display of wisdom, power, and goodness; and because in light, associated with heat, as expressed in the Hebrew AUR, is the vital principle of animated nature. After light, the ethereal, as essential to the separation of the various creations, as well as to life; probably itself the effect of the electric principle associated with light. Then the separation of land and water, as prerequisite to vegetable existence; then the clothing of the new formed earth with vegetable apparel; next the sun, moon, and stars to nourish those plants, and shrubs, and trees; for although they could be made without this influence, they could not live or flourish without it. Then the peopling of the waters and the air after the vegetable kingdom produced them subsistence. Finally, the earth-borns, when all things were ready for their nourishment and defence. And last of all, man, for whom, as the ultimate end, all mundane things exist.

John. How could light and darkness alternate so as to produce night and day three days before the sun, moon, and stars were created?

Olympas. Have you never observed the Aurora Borealis, sometimes called the Northern Lights, irradiate our portion of the earth almost with the brightness of day? Now this is demonstrated to be electric light, or, if you please, primitive light; and we have only to con-

ceive of an increase of said light and of the rotatory motion of the earth on its axis, antecedent to the creation of the celestial luminaries. Terrestrial light, or the light of electricity, was necessarily prior to solar light, as an agent to form the expanse or firmament; the medium through which the "bright effulgence" of solar light reaches our eyes. Into this light the earth merged as it now merges into solar light because of its diurnal motion. But, Edward, are we to suppose that the process of creation can be fully comprehended by man?

Edward. God's ways are often inscrutable, and he is said to dwell in light, to which no man can approach.

Olympas. We do not, then, seek to explain the process; but we intend to show that it is as congruous to our reason as any thing we can imagine; or, in other words, that it cannot be rationally objected to: so far from it, that the more the order of creation is considered, the more philosophy—the more wisdom will be discovered in it. The creation is a grand original. It had no model. It was no imitation or resemblance of antecedent existences. The archetype of the whole and of each part lay eternally in the deep recesses of the Supreme Intelligence. But we must interrogate you more particularly on the formation and primitive state of man. This, however, we must reserve for the evening lesson. A. C.

CONVERSION, A REAL CHANGE.

Mr. and Mrs. S., of the city of V—s, were a very polite and accomplished pair. They were amongst the *elite* of the city, and fashionable to a scruple. Their children were ever and anon thrumming it away on the piano, and taking lessons in the dancing school. They were genteelly hypocritical; could smile without good humor; laugh without being pleased; sigh without being sad; and could be polite without affection or esteem. The parents held a very honorable pew in a fifty thousand dollar church, and sabbatically listened to a superb literary performance; in which the parson, the choir, and the clerk handsomely performed their respective parts. The sermon was always delightfully short, rhetorically composed, and elegantly read. The prayer was pompously august, and admirably adapted to the chaste ears of a literary and philosophic audience. The choir were accomplished theatricals—the organ cost a thousand dollars—consequently the music was superbly sacred. The amateurs were in ecstacies during the grave sweet melodies of their devotions.

But Mr. and Mrs. S. happened to hear a proclaimer of the old-fashioned gospel of Christ, who in his itinerations visited a watering place for health, to which they had resorted for pleasure. The plain, intelligent, and pathetic orator knew well how to do his Master's work. He stated the gospel facts, developed their import, urged the precepts,

and stored away the promises in the minds of his hearers. Those who came for amusement waited to pray, and amongst these were found the visiters from V—s. Their hearts were pierced; their consciences awoke. They became deeply interested, and were constant attendants on the ministry of brother P. In a few evenings they made the good confession, renounced the world, the flesh, and the devil—put on Christ, and united themselves to the church of Antioch in their own city.

They were found on the next Lord's day in the plain garb of the new brotherhood. Their fineries were put off when they put on Christ. Their children were immediately taken from the dancing school. They continued to perfect the science of music; but it was indeed sacred music. The Bible became the burthen of the morn and of the even, and the standing topic of the day. Hymn-singing and social rejoicings occupied the hours of frivolous gossipping; and, indeed, the house of our new convert, from being the resort of fashion and of noisy merriment, became a Bethel—a house where prayer was wont to be made and hymns to be sung. 'Surely,' said all that knew the family, 'there is a *power* in religion yet; and conversion is in truth a change of heart and a change of life. A. C.

OUR NAME.

"I SAID, Age should speak, and length of days should teach wisdom."—But "I also will show my opinion." "Words are wind;" and I am truly sorry to see a "*name*" making such a stir among us. *Cui bono?*

If it were *necessary* to single out any one appellation from the scriptures, by which alone we would call ourselves, and be called, I would choose with brother Scott the name *Christian*. But I have two objections to this:—First, the thing cannot be done; and, in the second place, if it could be, it is not desirable; for we have no precedent in the scriptures of truth. The ancient Christians never thus sought to appropriate to themselves any one particular name!! They used indifferently, in addressing each other, some twenty different appellations; as, "Brethren," "holy brethren," "saints;" "the sanctified in God the Father," "the faithful," "the believers." I have called you "*friends*," says the Saviour: "you are my *friends* if you do whatsoever I command you." They were "kings and priests to God"—"a royal priesthood"—"a holy nation, a purchased people." But they received these dignified titles for a far more important purpose than the fixing of "their name" It was that they should "show forth the praises of Him who had called them from darkness into his marvellous light." Is it not, then, vastly more important that we seek to establish a right

character than a right *name?* If we even should chance to get a *mean name* fastened upon us, good characters can make that name *honorable!* But, 'Alas! what [good name] can ennoble sots, or slaves, or cowards!" One of Cicero's friends advised him in his youth to have his name changed, as he thought one of his talents ought to have a more dignified name than "a bean." Cicero replied, "I intend by my conduct to make my name, however insignificant, as honorable as that of any other man." How contemptible did Antiochus Epiphanes render himself by selecting such a pompous title—"Illustrious"!! His contemporaries said, "He ought rather to have called himself Epimanes," "a mad man." Let us not then, brethren, "aim at high things" in choosing a *name;* let us not deceive ourselves or others by a name which we do not deserve: for, verily, the three-fourths of all the professing Christians I have ever seen, of all denominations, would be more appropriately called "Disciples of Mammon, or of Bacchus, or Tobacco, than disciples of Him who was "meek and lowly," "who went about doing good," who was a pattern of self-denial, and "had not where to lay his head."

Let us then, brethren, exert all our energies to the formation of perfect characters, and leave the *name to follow*, as the *shadow* does the *substance!* If we deserve a *good* name, we shall assuredly receive it from all just beings: and as to the rest, it is no matter what *they* call us; for, as has been well quoted by our brother D. A., "the world knoweth us not." But if they even give us a bad name, "who shall harm us if we be followers of that which is good." Let us so live that it may be said of us, as was said of the ancient Christians, "See how these Christians *love one another;*" and then they may call us, as they did them, "Christians," or "Nazarenes," or "Atheists," or what they please. But I entreat my brethren not to turn aside to contend about shadows; for such, truly, are names!!

> "*Contend for nothing but the* fruit
> *That feeds the immortal mind;*
> *For fruitless leaves no more dispute,*
> *But leave them to the wind.*"

Since writing the above I have fallen upon a number of "The Christian," edited by W. W. Eaton, at St. John, New Brunswick. It contains an article on "Our Name." From the amiable and sentimental style this article (and indeed the whole number) is written, I should have fallen in love with brother Eaton, if I had even disapproved of all his reasonings. I must say the essay is very specious, and contains some very strong reasons why we should call ourselves "Chris-

tians." I again say, that if we could have *but one* name, I should prefer *this*. I might have been convinced by the specious arguments and the winning spirit of brother Eaton, to adopt his views, did I not know positively that the ancient Christians called each other indiscriminately and indifferently by nearly twenty different names. I therefore entreat my beloved brother Eaton to labor with love and zeal to accomplish such a reformation in *character* with the brethren, that they may be *indeed* what he would nave them in *name*.

CHRISTIANOS.

P. S. The brethren will have the goodness to pardon my presumption in assuming to *myself individually* a name which I am rather unwilling *they* should take *collectively*.

COMMUNICATION.

NOTWITHSTANDING all that is said in the preceding article, by Christianos, and that has been said by others whom I sincerely love and respect in relation to the name by which the advocates and subjects of the proposed reformation should be known, it would appear that there is none so eligible or suitable as the name CHRISTIAN; and that for the following reasons:—1st. Because of the radical and comprehensive import of its appellative signification 2d. Because of its scriptural consistency with the intention of the proposed reformation.

1st. With respect to the former—its radical and comprehensive import, &c.—it is evident that it literally signifies a disciple and follower of Christ; from which, as a proper name, it is derived; and which is the very radix of Christianity;—upon which, of course, every scriptural appellation of a religious import, under the gospel dispensation, derives its religious significancy. For if a man be not a disciple and follower of Christ, he has no right to be called by any of the "different appellatives" by which Christians were wont to salute each other, as such. All other confessed or conceivable relations by which they did or could recognize each other, radically depended upon their confessed relationship to Christ, as his disciples and followers. Wherefore, the title CHRISTIAN comprehends and covers them all. 2. Nor, secondly, is it less consistent with the intention of the proposed reformation, for which some of us have been laboring both by tongue and pen, by pulpit and press, for, at least, thirty years. The professed object of which is, and has been, from our commencement—the restcationr of pure, primitive, apostolic Christianity in letter and spirit, in principle and practice; witness our "Declaration and Address," published at Washington, Pa., in the fall of 1809. Now this is that very religion—that very exhibition of Christianity, to which the appellative

of CHRISTIAN was primarily annexed; for the disciples of Christ were called Christians first at Antioch A. D. 43. Nor, indeed, can there be a more proper term; "for as many as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ:" therefore, surely they have as good a right to be called after *him*, as a woman has to be called after the *name* of *the man* of her choice, whom she has assumed as her head and husband. And is not this the very relation in which Christians are divinely said to stand to Jesus Christ? see 2 Cor. xi. 2.; Eph. v. 23.; "I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you a chaste virgin to Christ:" "For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church." Should Christians, then, consent to be recognized by any other name than that which brought them into the family of God?—by which they have become heirs of God—even joint heirs with Christ, their husband: compare Rom. vii. 4., with viii. 16, 17., and Gal. iii. 26! "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus.—And if children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint heirs with Christ."—Hence—"All things are yours"—for "you are Christ's." Can any name, then, be more appropriate, more distinguishing, more comprehensive, more glorious, or more scriptural than that of CHRISTIAN? Or can *any name* suit better with the ultimate intention of the proposed reformation: viz.—the scriptural unity and unanimity of the professors of Christianity, without which they can never convert the world? Surely no. For while one says, "I am of Paul"—another, "I am of Apollos"—the professing body must be divided; and, while continuing so, it can never succeed, prevail, or prosper: "For every kingdom divided against itself is brought to desolation." Matth. xii. 25. Wherefore our Lord prays so earnestly for the unity of all who should believe in his name, that so the world might be converted: see John xvii. 11.; 20.—Nothing, therefore, is more obviously necessary for this purpose, than that professed believers be professedly united in the *one name*, the *one* faith, and the *one* love, of the *one* Lord and Master;—both in order to their own peace and comfort, and also for the success of the blessed cause in which they are professedly engaged.

These things being evidently so, what signifies all the objections that have been, or can be made to that worthy name by which the disciples of Christ have been called from the beginning? What if some have abused it? Is the abuse of a good thing any reason for the disuse or rejection of it? If so, *what* is it that has not been abused? But—"It is not sufficiently distinguishing." Why? Is it because that some who assume it, have practised or taught, something inconsistent with the genuine truth and purity of our holy religion? Grant it: and what then? May not any name or title be thus abused? And can any appellation

be better calculated to keep us right than that of CHRISTIAN? Surely no name can possibly combine in it so many interesting considerations to excite us to every thing that is good, honorable, and praise-worthy, as the name CHRISTIAN. It is, without exception, the most exalting, the most honorable, and distinguishing title under heaven. Excited, therefore, by these considerations, let us hold it fast, and endeavor to walk worthy of it. T. C.

COMMUNICATION.

Jacksonville, Illinois, November 11, 1839.

My dear brother Campbell—

FROM you I have received no private communication for a long—long time. For this I blame you not, seeing you have so many more interesting correspondents. Your Harbinger, kindly sent, and thankfully received, I have always read with much interest. To a few numbers, the last, on OUR NAME, I have objections. Some of those objections I stated in a letter to brother Walter Scott. Whether he may make them public or not, I cannot tell, nor am I concerned. I met with your remarks in the October number, in Missouri, and in a hasty manner wrote mine. I am sorry, very sorry, that you have written as you did. I can anticipate no good results, but evil. It appears to be uncalled for. We were all living in peace and harmony, and the good cause prospering. You well knew the great attachment thousands of us had to the name *Christian*, and many believed from your writing that you had adopted it as the most appropriate name. You also knew that many could not conscientiously be called *Disciples*, as a family name. You knew your two warmest friends, J. T. Johnson and myself, rejected the title of our Hymn-Book, because it was called the Disciples' Hymn-Book. Brother Campbell, ought you not to have respected the feelings of so many, who united their energies with *yours* in promoting the common cause? The reasons given by you for rejecting the name *Christian*, because you were anticipated by a people in the East and in some parts of our country, who are Unitarians, and who do not baptize for the remission of sins, nor break the loaf every first day, are the things so objectionable, and objected to by all, whom I have heard speak on the subject. They think you have rejected virtually all such from any claim of being disciples of Christ. Myself and thousands of others have been called Unitarians by our enemies, though I ever denied the name. How cordially did I agree with you in the Apostles' Creed. Were I to adopt any other beside the Bible, it would certainly be this *ex-animo*. Have you altered your views? Do inform me. If you really design to purge out all Unitarians from the Disciples, as is thought by some, do inform me your definition of a Unitarian. If none are to be reckoned Disciples of Christ, unless they baptize for remission, what do you think of those who never use the phrase *I baptize for remission*, when they baptize a person? Of this number of immersers I am one, yet I as firmly believe the doctrine of baptism for remission as you do. With you I also believe that it would be improper in many cases to use these words in the act

of baptizing, seeing many have received remission prior to their baptism. You have admitted this, when you admit that there are Christians among the sects. If a Christian, he must have been justified or pardoned, and a partaker of the Spirit; for an unpardoned Christian, having not the Spirit, is an anomaly in Christianity. I do think with you, there are Christians among the sects, and therefore would think it improper to baptize them for remission. They had the spirit of obedience, but had been educated in Babylon, and had drunk of her wine too deeply, and by it were blinded to this duty.

My dear brother, I write freely to you. The brethren in Missouri are grieved with myself at these things. I do hope they have misapprehended you—that you do not design to establish another sectarian party—that you do not design to co-operate with Trinitarians against Unitarians—that you do not design unchristianizing those who cordially embrace the Apostles' Creed; especially those who take the Bible alone for their rule of faith and practice—that you do not make the opinion of a pious believer, differing from your opinion, a bar to fellowship. Do, my brother, inform me.

I am confident, brother Campbell, that the *Christians* in the East, and in some other sections of our country, have not been treated with that forbearance and love enjoined by the gospel. A few hot-heads ill-informed leaders among them, labored to excite their hearers against the reformation. Had they been dealt with in the meekness of wisdom. glorious would have been the results; but harshness has driven them farther astray; and the doctrine (not of the reformation) that none have their sins remitted but by being baptized for remission has rivetted their prejudices. Yet their case is not hopeless. I know, I am well well pursuaded, that I could influence them so far, that they would agree to meet us in convention, and adjust matters to mutual satisfaction. *Quære*—Shall we try? Again: Would it not be advisable that you soften the hard objectionable features of your numbers on OUR NAME? Without it, much mischief will be done.

O! for the wisdom of the serpent and harmlessness of the dove! I have just returned from a preaching tour in Missouri. There were, during my stay, sixty or seventy additions. I hear much said about obedience, and too many confine or almost restrict the term to baptism. and the weekly supper: prayer is sadly neglected, especially family prayer, love to God and man—peace with all men—set your affections on things above, not on things on earth.

I must close. May grace, mercy, and peace be with you! Farewell, my brother, B. W. STONE.

AND OUR NAME.

MY remarks on OUR NAME, elicited at this time by a query from our amiable and intelligent brother Rucker, of Georgia, have occasioned much discussion, and some irritating, and, in my humble opinion, unchristian remarks. I speak not now in reference to the preceding documents from fathers Stone and Campbell, but in reference to sundry others which have appeared elsewhere. True, indeed, some of our

brethren who think too much authority is attached to my opinions, and too little to their own, are in all good conscience compelled to seize every favorable opportunity of endeavoring to lessen the former, and to increase the latter. I can, indeed, most fraternally sympathize with them, because of their extreme conscientiousness and refined sensibility on this subject. They are piously afraid that a power in other hands might be wielded disadvantageously, which, in their own, could be so safely trusted and so happily employed to the promotion of truth and good order. To persons so constituted it must always be as gratifying to their benevolence, as it is promotive of their honor, to seize any unpopular expression or opinion of mine, and make out of it a broad axe to hew down the aforesaid supposed authority, even if it should only increase their own as it lessened mine.

Others again, perhaps not so morally sensitive on the subject of too much authority in my hands, as they are mindful of their former position to the name *Christian*, having laid, perhaps, an undue emphasis upon the designation, are preternaturally excited on any indication that seems to impinge upon the prejudices and feelings which they may have helped to create on this subject. Some of these have pronounced precocious plaudits on the benevolent efforts of those who assume their old side of the controversy, whom they patronizingly and graciously stimulate by their smiles to increased exertions in behalf of their old partialities.

Well, all this is poor human nature, which, in its best estate, is altogether vanity, and an object of pity and forbearance, rather than of anger and resentment. We can bear with these indications without the slightest ripple on the placid tide of our good feeling: for we do not love these brethren because they are either perfect in knowledge or in character, but because they desire to be. Nor were we so ignorant of human nature as to expect that those who have preached a hundred sermons on the divine and exclusive authority of the name *Christian*, and wrote a thousand pages, first and last, upon its supernatural charms and sanctions, are to be, all of a sudden, satisfied with any proof that this high and authoritative ground of theirs is neither more nor less than a good-natured and well-meant assumption, of which themselves are not so much the authors as the adopters.

Well now, I trust that all these zealous and loyal brethren will allow me frankly to show cause why they are too sanguine and too fast, as well as too ideal in all their speculations upon this, to them, very engrossing subject.

I gave some reasons for my preference for the name *Disciple*. These have been assailed with spirit, if not with power; and not even the

argument, but the very style itself has been scrutinized with unusual perspicacity. One of my reasons for the preference given, was, and still is, *that the name* DISCIPLE (which is understood by all to be elliptical, and equivalent to disciple of the Lord, or of Christ,*) *is more scriptural.*

This it seems was not sufficiently rhetorical; for one brother, generally discriminating, just at that time discovered that the word *scriptural* is a peculiar adjective, that has no degrees of comparison; that if any thing be scriptural, it is so; that it is neither more, nor most so. Thus if *disciple* be found one hundred and ten times in the New Testament, and the name *Christian* just three times, the latter is as scriptural as the former. James, who wrote one epistle, is as scriptural as Paul, who wrote fourteen. This is, to say the least, hypercritical; or being "righteous overmuch."

Alexander Cruden, in his Concordance, the best in the world, says—"The word *disciple*, absolutely taken, signifies in the New Testament, a believer, a Christian, a scholar, a follower of Christ or his Apostles, as in Acts vi. 1."—"When the number of the disciples was multiplied;" and ix. 1., where it is said, "Paul yet breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord." He quotes this word as occurring more than one hundred times in the New Testament. For this reason we say it is more scriptural, more frequently found in the New Testament, than the word *Christian.* This no person can deny.

But enough has appeared on this subject; and as we are all passive in receiving a name, and cannot compel the public to call us what we please, I shall only attempt one point, which, with me, is the only important one in the whole affair. It is this: *Have we any divine authority for being called Christians?* I do not ask, Have we any divine authority for being *exclusively* called Christians; for I believe all our brethren give that up; but the question is, *Have we any divine authority for being called Christians at all?* The same question may be variously propounded—as, for example, Was the name *Christian* first given by Heaven or earth, by God or man? Or was it recommended by human authority, and finally adopted by divine authority?

Those who affirm that it was given by divine authority from the days of John Newton till now, have relied upon the verb *chreematizo*, found in Acts xi. 26., as importing they were *divinely called* Christians firs at Antioch; but it never has been shown that such is the fixed meaning of that word, which is essential to the argument from it; indeed, no one, I believe, has ever assumed that it necessarily means so. Others

* As the term *disciple* is always elliptical, and includes the teacher, it is unnecessary to say that it is the same as "disciples of the Lord," or "of Christ." I never heard of but one person that denied this.

again have assumed that *Christian* is the new name by which God's people were to be called, as intimated in Isaiah lx. 3. But that was in the days of text-preaching, when the context had little or nothing to do with the interpretation of any passage: for now all are satisfied that the new name there spoken of is *Hepzibah*—"the delight of the Lord," or "My delight is in her." But although we are not called upon to prove that this name was not given by divine authority, our friends being obliged to offer proof that it was; we may fearlessly affirm, from all that has recently been written on the subject, and from all that is in the New Testament, that no person can possibly prove that it was divinely introduced or sanctioned.

One great fact or two on record, in my judgment for ever precludes the possibility of such proof. It is a fact that the disciples were not first called Christians at Jerusalem, but at Antioch. Now as from Jerusalem went forth the law and the word of the Lord, and as the Holy Spirit was then fully communicated to the Apostles, and they had a full revelation of the whole institution and of the Master's will, whatever name they gave to the followers of Christ was of divine authority, and no other. The question, then, is, What did the Holy Spirit then call them? I answer, Certainly not *Christian;* for Luke says they were called *Christians first at Antioch.* The matter is then decided forever, that the followers of Christ were not called Christians by divine authority, unless the Apostles received a new revelation or command some fourteen years after the day of Pentecost. For according to the chronology of those who differ from us, as well as of those who agree, the disciples were called Christians at Antioch fourteen years after the descent of the Spirit, and never before.

But a second fact, equally conclusive, is, that Luke did not write his Acts of the Apostles for *twenty-one years* after they were called Christians first at Antioch. Paul, according to the received chronology, came to Rome A. D. 63, and Luke did not write his Acts for two years afterwards: for he writes in them that Paul "lived two years in Rome in his own hired house;" consequently he could not have written that book till the end of 64. Now if the name *Christian* had been given in *Antioch*, twenty-one years before, by divine command, what an ungodly man must Luke have been during these *twenty-one years* after, and fourteen before—in all, thirty-five years—never to have called them Christians; but, on the contrary, waywardly and frowardly to have called them *disciples* all the while; and even in the very next fact that he writes in the very face of his intimating that they were *divinely* called Christians, (according to some of our Evangelists and teachers,) he obstinately says, verse 29, "In the days of Claudius Cesar, the

disciples, every man," &c. Unless, then, we suppose this man Luke to have been a bold and daring offender against a divine revelation, it is infallibly certain that he and his companions, the Apostles, did not receive the name Christian as coming from Heaven, but from the rude and profane Antiochans.

But it is assumed that Paul admitted it as of divine authority when it fell from the lips of king Agrippa. Paul was not such an admirer of regal grandeur as to hold the words of a king divine; nay, he modestly declined the name in the presence of Agrippa. For when the king said, "Paul, thou almost persuadest me to be a Christian," Paul does not say, "I would to God that not only thou, but all that hear me this day, were not only almost, but altogether" *Christians*. Nay, verily, he says, "altogether such as I am, except these chains." The reason was then what it is now. The enemies of Christ desired to put him on a footing with Plato, Pythagoras, Aristotle, and other philosophic and political aspirants, heads of parties, leaders, and thus to place his religion and his party on a par with others according to the ruling custom of the age; by which they hoped to humble his pretensions and exalt their own. The Apostles, therefore, as appears from all their writings, never once adopted the name. They call themselves and one another by numerous and various names, but never by that name.

Thus Paul waived an appropriation of the name so complimentarily given him by the king. As, for example, should a German prince have said to Zuinglius when pleading the cause of Protestantism before him, 'Zuinglius, thou almost persuadest me to be a *Lutheran*,' Zuinglius, perceiving his drift, would, in the spirit of Paul, not reply—'O! Prince! I would to heaven that you were not only almost, but altogether, a Lutheran; but altogether such as I am, except my unfortunate circumstances.' So I think an uncommitted person would understand Paul before Agrippa.

But the term is once more found, 1 Pet. iii. 16. The Apostle intimates a fiery trial, persecution, reproaches, and sufferings for the name of Christ. The name Christian being then common among the enemies of Christ, as Luke intimated in the year 64, by telling when and where it first began; and it was then usual to indict, try, and kill the holy brethren under the name Christian. "If, then," says Peter, "any one suffer under this name of reproach and suffering (*as a Christian*,) let him not be ashamed," &c. These are the only times the name is found in holy writ. Paul and Peter having suffered under Nero, all antiquity dates his 1st Epistle about the year 60, four years before Luke wrote the Acts of the Apostles. We have, then, unequivocal evidence

that even after the time of Peter's two letters, the brethren called each other disciples, and had not then adopted the name Christian, though so current in the world as to be mentioned three different times in the space of thirty years in the inspired writings.

It is an instructive fact that the same year (A. D. 60,) in which Peter uses the word *Christian* as bandied about by Roman magistrates and people, the saints called each other *brethren* and *disciples*. For A. D. 60, Luke says "the *disciples*" came together to break the loaf at Troas; while Peter spoke of their persecution under the title of Christians in the same year, and not far from the same place. The world, then, it seems called them Christians while they called themselves disciples and brethren, &c. down to A. D. 64.

Not to repeat what has been so often and so well said by others—such as if the Lord had, in the judgment of the Apostles, anthorized or approved this name, I ask, Would they not have immediately and ever after adopted it in preference to all others, as was the fact when Abram was changed into Abraham, and Sarai into Sarah? Even courtesy decreed that when the names Saul and Joses were changed into Pau and Barnabas, the old name should no more be used; or that they should thence be designated by the new name. I say, we need not to repeat what has already been so well said, and so often said by others. The disciples were immersed into *the name* of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. This holy name, neither Jesus nor Christ, was put or called upon them by divine authority.

Now as Father Stone and Father Campbell consider that *Disciples of Christ* and *Christians* are identical expressions so far as import is concerned, all they allege about being called after him is as applicable to the term *disciple* as to the term *Christian;* for neither of them are among those weak scholars who cannot conscientiously be called disciples as a family name, on the hypothesis that the name disciple does not imply its own ellipsis—Christ. We are God's heritage; for we are Christ's, and Christ is God's. The numerous essays which have appeared on this subject have convinced me that I conceded too much in my first articles upon the name. I have, however, no desire to impose any name upon any person without his own consent—much less upon our brethren. Therefore I cannot consent to any one fixing upon me, under the pretension of a divine warrant, a name either exclusively or at all, because of their peculiar attachment to it.

As a *human* designation, we call our religion *Christianity*, and its professors *Christians*. I have used these words as often as most men of my age; but I use them not as divine, or exclusive names, but as I

use other words—by common consent. The followers of Christ had several nicknames; but, as already shown, they had a variety of names chosen by themselves and sanctioned by the Apostles. The saints—the brethren—the holy brethren—the children of God—the disciples—are names and titles of divine authority; and if by common consent the name Christian import just as much, neither more nor less; then, as I have said, I hold it to be indifferent whether we are called Disciples or Christians; and as written by me, before I saw a single remark from any brother on the subject, I only give my reasons why I vote for Disciple in preference to Christian. I commenced with four reasons: I still cherish them; and the discussion has given me a fifth—viz: that we have divine authority for *Disciple*, and sundry other names, and none for *Christian*.

Still as some glory in it, because many were persecuted to death under it, I am not ashamed of it. Our brethren have gone too far however, on this point, as well as on some others. They have affirmed that *all the ancient martyrs* suffered under this name. This only shows, when prejudice and feeling are a little excited, how memory and judgment alike fail. *Not one of the most ancient martyrs suffered under that name:* for Stephen, the protomartyr himself, and all the subjects of the first persecution, during Paul's opposition to Christ, and long afterwards, died under another name than that of Christian: for "the disciples were called Christians *first* at Antioch," many years after the death of Stephen and the conversion of Paul.

I have no desire to expose a number of similar errors and mistakes in the various pieces I have read on the name: for, as already said, if the brethren will agree to be called by all the names in the New Testament; or if they will use the name Christian to represent just the same sort of people that were so named by the Antiochans, I will cheerfully go with them. I have not cast my anchor, or said if all the world would call themselves Christians, I will call myself a Disciple.

This reminds me of a circumstance I heard the other day. Two teamsters happened to meet on the brow of a very bad hill: the one ascending with a heavy load, requested the one descending with an empty waggon to drive out of the track, as universal custom and courtesy required, and let him ascend in the best part of the road. But, on receiving a peremptory refusal from his neighbor, "Well," said he, "rather than we should fight about it, my horses being in good plight, I will try and get out of *your* way." So say I: if any one say he will not leave the smooth path of his own partialities, I will not dispute with him—I will get out of his way. I have given only some of my

reasons: I believe them all good and sufficient, and think that time and experience will justify them; but whether or not, I am perfectly indifferent, if so be we can only possess the character and exhibit the virtues of the true followers of Christ.

But let all remember that those who were first called Christians in Antioch, were persons who had first believed the gospel preached by the Apostles—had then repented of their sins—were then immersed into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit—met the first day of every week—showed forth the Lord's death—contributed freely to the necessities of saints, and kept the apostolic ordinances. Will those who contend for this name do the same things, and exhibit the same moral excellencies! If so, I will call them Christians, if that will please them better than *Disciples*, or any other name; so far superior, in my judgment, is the thing to the name—the fruit to the blossom—the living man to the inanimate statue—the character to the profession. It will be remembered that I have used almost indiscriminately sundry names, and will likely continue to do so; for where the Lord has made me free, I cannot, without good cause, agree to bind myself.

Before I dismiss this subject, I must say, that I did not imagine that I could or did hurt the feelings of Father Stone, by any thing I had written on "our name." I am therefore sorry that I was disappointed in reference to him, and hope he will forgive me, when he is assured that I did not intend it. It is true, I knew he had partialities; but I had thought that both he and I had got beyond that point, and that he was able to hear, without feeling, the investigation of any question whatever. There are sundry points in his communication irrelevant to the point in hand, which I cannot now discuss.

Touching baptism, I must indeed say, I do not believe but in one baptism, and that for the remission of sins; but do not suppose it always necessary to say in the act of baptizing, "I immerse you for remission of sins;" but certainly the candidate ought always so to understand it. I could not immerse an angel, nor a perfect Christian. But if one of these sectarian Christians, of which Father Stone and I speak, should happen to come to me desiring baptism, I would immerse him for the remission of his sectarian sins, and especially for his sinful ignorance of the Lord's ordinances and long neglect of duty. When a person has no sins to confess, I do not baptize him. Baptism can neither be the *seeking* nor "the *answer* of a good conscience" to the man that has no sins from which to be released.

A. C.

AN EXCURSION.

We have but just returned from an excursion of some 1200 miles, on which we spent just six weeks, and pronounced some forty public discourses. We visited the cities of Louisville and Lexington, and also the seats of literature, Danville and Harrodsburg, and some intermediate points in Kentucky. We also spoke a few discourses in Indiana, in the commercial cities of New Albany and Madison—and in Cincinnati, Ohio.

Our excursion, though exceedingly laborious, was nevertheless pleasing and interesting. We saw many brethren, both public and private, and had the pleasure of witnessing a number of accessions to some of the churches as we passed along. We occasionally enjoyed the company of many of our old acquaintances, fellow-laborers in the Lord's vineyard; as well as that of some new ones, amongst whom especially was that of brother Thomas Smith, of Kentucky; and brother N. Short, of Indiana—brethren of good intelligence, excellent spirit, and of eminent labors and usefulness in the kingdom; with the last of whom we had before no personal acquaintance, and not much with the former. With these brethren we had much communion, as well as with brother Stewart, of Albany; brother Creath,; brother Elley, of Louisville; brother Hall, of Lexington; brother J. T. Johnson, with the brethren Mortons; brother Taffe, my constant fellow-traveller; brother E. Smith, now I trust safely in the bosom of our South Carolina and Georgia brethren; and brother M. Cole, of Indiana.

I mention these names that the sources of my intelligence may be known, when I say, that the standard of Christian piety and the standard of Christian morality must yet be elevated higher before the ancient order of things is fully restored. I could name another class of men, of equally sound judgment, though not public men, consequently not of so conspicuous standing—old disciples, elders of churches; such as brethren Poindexter, Chinn, and Fitch, of Lexington; brethren Bullock, Curd, Craig, Duval, Payne, of Woodford; brother Sims, of Nicholasville; brethren Nuckols, of Shelby and Versailles; brethren Tibbs, Runyans, Sandige, of Mason. These represent a large class, who also join in the same judgment. These all will give their voice that the standard of piety and morality must be elevated throughout the land. Even the young evangelists themselves, such as brother Brown, of Indiana, and Pinkerton, of Kentucky, give the same testimony.

Beloved brethren, our theory, in the judgment of most of the sects themselves, is excellent—the best, as we solemnly think, in the world: our practice must therefore be the best. It will never do for us to say we are as good, as excellent as our sectarian professors. We must be primitive in spirit, conversation, behaviour, and universal excellence. I rejoice that all classes are beginning to awaken to this subject—the Elders of the churches, the old Pastors, the young Evangelists—all, all say we must go forward. In the name of the Lord, then, brethren, let us march up to the standard of ancient godliness and righteousness. Of this, much more hereafter.

The work of conversion in the Western States has gone on this year

in advance of all former years. Thousands have been added to the Lord, and the work still goes on. Senior brethren are improving in their taste for the good intellectual and moral training of their children, and in their care for the new converts. They are also increasing in the liberality of their contributions for the gospel, and for the building of convenient and comfortable meeting-houses. We had the pleasure of speaking in several new houses much more scientifically and comfortably constructed; several them on the plan suggested in our former numbers The brethren in Woodford, bordering on Mount Vernon, have erected a very convenient, substantial, and, for a country place, a capacious building during the last season; so have the brethren in Brunerstown, Jefferson county, Kentucky. Since last we visited New Albany, the brethren there also have builded themselves a large and commodious house, well constructed. In Madison the brethren have just completed for themselves a suitable house. In Ohio, too, the good work of erecting comfortable meeting-houses has increased much during the last year. Although a good meeting-house is not an infallible test of the intelligence, devotion and zeal of a Christian community, it is a very prepossessing and favorable one; and certainly a house in ruins is very decisive evidence of a declining, weak, and tottering community. A. C.

THE COLLEGE AT HARRODSBURG.

The removal of Bacon College from Georgetown to Harrodsburg appears to me, since my visit there, to be even more judicious and advantageous than I had before imagined. Amongst the advantages gained I rank that of the surrounding atmosphere as very important to the prosperity of the institution: I mean, neither the superior salubrity of the air, nor the justly celebrated efficacy of its mineral waters; but I allude to the moral atmosphere, as breathing more auspiciously upon the youth and destiny of the College. There was a *prejudice*—a deep and dark sectarian prejudice against the College, from neighborhood rivalries and clashings, which exist not at Harrodsburg. It is the wish and the effort, so far as I could learn, of all the circumjacent country to foster and cherish the institution without regard to creed or party. The difficulty of maintaining discipline in the midst of an extensive opposition to an institution few persons can estimate. I hold it to be impossible. Whereas, when all the neighborhood round seeks the prosperity of an institution, the arm of discipline is strengthened, while the necessity for it is diminished. It is as impossible to have a good, healthy, moral institution flourish amidst the bitter jealousies and sectarian hates of an opposing neighborhood, as it is to have the delicate and tender shrubs and plants of India to bloom and flourish in the boreal winters of Asiatic Siberia.

The fears and the objections which arose in my mind on first hearing of the location, from the fact that it is one of the most popular and fashionable watering places in all the southern country—the resort not merely of age and infirmity, but of youth and gaiety, of beauty and fashion, have been happily removed in learning from the accomplished

DEAF AND DUMB ASYLUM.

Dr. Graham, the proprietor of the springs, in person, that the two months of that species of resort, and almost exclusively the only season of it, are the very two months of the vacation, and a withdrawal of the students to their homes. Those who attend these medicinal waters for real benefit, the sick and the afflicted, attend occasionally at all times during the summer; but these are quite a different complexion of spirits from those July and August visiters, who have other motives and other interests than bodily cures in both their heads and hearts, which during the dog days attract them to this Kentucky Elysium.

While there I learned from the Professors that the College was constantly receiving new accessions. At that time they had about 80 students, to whom I had the pleasure of addressing a few extemporaneous remarks on the claims and pretensions of Philosophy compared with those of Revelation.

Though the institution is well superintended by a *pro tempore* President, I think had it a regular and fixed head of celebrity, such as I have reason to think they may soon obtain, it will certainly be an institution deserving not merely the support of our brethren in Kentucky, but the community in general. The Professors are spoken of not only by our brethren, but by the community, who know their worth, as men of the right stamp, both as respects literature, science, didactic talents, and moral excellence. With the respectability and prosperity of this institution to a certain extent the literary and political respectability of the cause of reform in Kentucky is involved; and therefore it behooves those who have put their shoulders to the wheels to be persevering and energetic in all lawful means of increasing its patronage and extending its usefulness and respectability—in doing which, they have my most cordial wishes for their success. A. C.

DEAF AND DUMB ASYLUM, *DANVILLE;*

AND

MR. LEONARD'S SCHOOL, *LOUISVILLE.*

Having in contemplation a new Literary and Moral Institution, of enlarged dimensions, in harmony with the entire constitution of man, physical, intellectual, and moral, I feel myself obliged, as far as my opportunity affords, to visit all schools of acknowledged merit, as I do to examine all the reputable systems and theories of education of this age of reforms. In pursuance of my plan I visited the Deaf and Dumb Institution at Danville. If I recollect right, the accomplished President of this Institution informed me there were not yet more than some forty mutes in attendance. This ingenious and useful art of instructing the deaf suggests many reflections to those who address the ear. The visibles and the audibles would mutually improve each other if they would more minutely study the philosophy of their respective systems. Those who teach the deaf have to do exclusively with the eyes; while those who address the ear are not obliged exclusively to adapt their instructions to that organ. Yet they are almost exclusive in their manner. This ought not to be. We were much pleased with

the display of the proficiency of the students of this Institution. Mr. Leonard, of Louisville, has most happily combined in his plan the advantages of both systems, and superadded something of great value of his own. I was astonished to find in the city of Louisville, so distinguished for its literary taste and the number of its well educated, and indeed learned men, so small a school under the tuition of so accomplished and so original a teacher as this truly scientific and practical man. Only twelve boys, at the moderate fee of 100 dollars a-year for tuition Some would call this immoderately dear. Verily, I hazard nothing in saying that it is cheaper than the best common system of education for boys from 6 to 12 years, at one-fourth the price. I had not examined his plan and his pupils more than one hour, before I began to regret that the school was in a city, else I would forthwith, for at least a couple of years, have sent my son of 8 years old to it. I would rather pay 100 dollars than 20 for one year's training of a child in such an institution. Does any one ask, What is the mystery of the plan? I answer, It is a very great mystery. Mr. Leonard cultivates the understanding and makes his pupils understand every thing they do—almost, too, without the use of books. He teaches *orally*, yet uses some books; yet I say he teaches *orally*. He has his *black board*, and the boys have their *slates;* and he makes them look, and reason, and comprehend. They learn to read by writing, and learn to write by reading. Lads of 8 and 9 worked for me simple equations in algebra, and explained every thing they did, as though they comprehended the whole elements of the science. Those who had never learned a grammar were skilled in the elements of that science, and lads were trained to commit their thoughts to writing on every thing propounded—if they had any thoughts at all on the subject.

Thus reading, writing, grammar, composition, the elements of geometry, algebra, arithmetic, were taught thoroughly, and habits of reasoning, discriminating, thinking, communicating, were forming, which must develope all the powers vouchsafed the lads. Perhaps I am too much in admiration of this plan, because it proves the practicability and utility of a favorite view I have long cherished—viz. of cultivating the understanding, and leaving the memory to take care of itself, which I now see it can do better far than under the old plan. The habits of observation, discriminating, reasoning, thus acquired, besides the actual avails of information gained, will doubtless commend the system of Mr. Leonard to all men of reflection, as the best conceivable mode of educating lads in their first setting out in the paths of real learning. Besides, and, though last mentioned, not least in value, such a school is not a prison, nor the teacher a mere keeper of a penitentiary. Boys regard much of the course as a real amusement, and often regard it as an affliction—a punishment to be kept from school. As a school for lads from 7 years to 12 or 14, this is decidedly the best I have yet seen. A. C.

DIFFICULTIES IN CHURCHES—*No. I.*

Difficulties in churches arise through want of discipline; and lack of discipline arises from inattention to the nature and necessity of it.—

The gospel dispensation, by its Author, is wisely compared to a drag-net, cast into the sea, which encloses fish clean and unclean, good and bad. The church may be pure in doctrine, pure in all theories, and pure in the aims and desires of the great majority of its members; but it has never been long pure of hypocrites, pretenders, and unrighteous persons. Among the twelve Apostles there was a Judas; in the church of Jerusalem there was an Ananias and Sapphira his wife; in the church of Samaria there was a Simon Magus; and in the churches of the Gentiles, planted by the Apostles, there were persons uncircumcised in heart and ears: and it is even so at the present hour, perhaps, in the best churches on earth. Hence the necessity of scriptural discipline, and hence the importance of correct views of it.

We have an adage of sage wisdom amongst the politicians of this world—"It is in the time of peace," say they, "that we ought to prepare for war." As the mariner, while in the harbor, or in a calm sea, prepares for storms and tempests, so ought the church in times of great peace and prosperity to prepare for times of trial, of difficulty and discipline. It is too late to debate about the law and the rules of discipline, when the case to which they ought to be applied is under consideration.

Some of our churches have passed through much tribulation from errors of this sort. The church in Richmond, the church in Baltimore,* the church in Lexington, and the church in Louisville have been distracted, divided, and alienated by errors in discipline; and had it not been for the recuperative energies of a good constitution and the vigor of the apostolic doctrine, unimpaired by human creeds and formularies, these churches would doubtless have perished from the way. But through the grace of God, and the excellency of our own constitution, the New Testament Scriptures, all these difficulties have been healed, and these churches are now re-united, and in a state of comparative prosperity. And long may they be so!

I am pretty well acquainted with the history of all these troubles, for I have been accurately informed of them from the beginning, and do unhesitatingly ascribe them all to a culpable ignorance of Christian discipline; or, what is still worse, to a shameful neglect of the practice of it. No doctrine, no sentiment, no speculative dogmas—nothing of the species of sectarian alienations, has ever occurred among any of them. Mal-administration, or error in discipline, was in every case the root of the evil—the source of all their misfortunes.

* I have every assurance that the brethren in Baltimore are cordially re-united, one brother only standing out, and I do most sincerely desire that he and all the brethren will be at all Christian pains and trouble to have every thing removed out of his way, that their joy and the joy of us all may be complete. Brethren who visit the city of Baltimore from the West, are affectionately invited to visit this church. Their meeting-house is in the centre of the city, not far from the Post Office.

"Happy the man," said a Roman moralist, "who makes the misfortunes of other men a lesson to himself." And happy the church, we say, that makes the errors and difficulties of other societies an admonition to herself? Discipline is neither taught, nor learned, nor practised in some churches at all: I mean Christian discipline. And yet it is, as respects themselves and one another, the most important lesson that they can learn.

Indeed the subject has been measurably neglected by our editors, scribes, and elders. Preachers, good preachers, are, for the most part, not indeed universally, but generally at least, very lame disciplinarians. It is a talent that is seldom associated with great powers of declamation. The talent of ruling well is, indeed, rarely possessed by great talkers. No good Admiral, General, Captain, or commander of any sort has been distinguished for much talking. There was no attribute of the orator in Napoleon, and very little in his conqueror, Lord Wellington. Alas for the church that is governed by a great preacher! Apollos was never appointed by Paul to set things in order.

"Old men for counsel, and young men for war." Let elders rule; not boys. England may have a woman to govern her, if she pleases, because she has a mighty Senate and an almighty House of Commons; but in Christ's monarchy there are neither Queens nor Dauphins: neither women nor boys sit in the seat of Moses nor of Christ.

The Baptist church government has been far-famed for its democracy. Jefferson is said to have got his *beau ideal* of the American Republic from a visit which, in his youth, he is said to have made to a Saturday meeting in a case of discipline, for which a Baptist church in his vicinity had assembled. The meeting of the late Congress might be appealed to as a proof of it. But fierce as our democracy is, it has been tamed by an old man. There is no Senate in the Baptist church, and therefore it is preposterous to assume that the sage of Monticello learned the frame-work of our government from a hundred and ten men, women, and children, meeting to try a delinquent for an offence against the Lord. In that assembly there was a *Moderator*, a very shrewd title, considering the elements to be governed; and the whole congregation was a Court of *Oyer and Terminer*. When the question was put, sixty-one, out of one hundred and ten, only voted—thirty for the delinquent's acquittal, and thirty-one against him. Forty-nine voted not at all. Thirty-one, then, was the governing vote. But in *weighing* the names after they were *counted*, eleven names of the thirty one were under age—actual minors, boys and girls; and of the remaining twenty *eleven were females*. Of the minority *thirteen* had the age, experience,

and wisdom of the church; while the remainder of the thirty were persons of full age and reason, and equal to the wisest on the other side. In weight the names were as one hundred to ten; but in count they were as thirty-one to thirty; and so President Numbers triumphed over Presidents Age, Experience, and Moral Excellence; and the delinquent was accordingly excluded.

This is the Baptist system in a strong case; but enough of instances in the history of our own times can be furnished that it is no false or suppositious one. Alas! too many have occurred in reference to our own brethren.

We believe in a senate, a presbytery, or an eldership for three reasons:—1st. Because, in the nature of the case, old men are better accomplished for the task; and, if not very near the people, are very near to God, and must soon give an account to him. 2d. Because God's ancient kingdom, while it was a theocracy, was governed by a senate—by the elders of Israel. And, 3d. Because "even so has the Lord ordained." Any one of the three is a sufficient reason; but the last is alone sufficient. The Apostles, at the command of the King, ordained a senate, a presbytery, an eldership—three names for the same thing—"*in every church*" which they set in order. "Titus," says Paul, "*ordain elders* in every city as I commanded thee." "Therefore let *the elders that rule well* be counted worthy of superior honor." And do you "obey them that have the rule over you; for they do watch for your souls," &c.

Many of our brethren were brought up under the latitudinarian democracy of Puritan independency, refined and improved by importation into the American Republics; and therefore their notions of unrestrained liberty and insubordination which sometimes appear amongst those educated under such a system.

The first thing, therefore, to obtain good order, is to have persons chosen and appointed for that very business. So Paul associated things in his mind when he said to Titus, "For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou mightest *set in order* the things wanting—and ordain elders in every city, as I have commanded thee." The first thing to setting in order the things deficient, is, therefore, the appointment of elders. This Titus was to have done. As the Apostles were commanded to preach the gospel to every creature, so the Apostle commanded these things to be done by others.

The character of the elders is next given. As to the meaning of appointment, or ordination, that was already established, and known over the whole world, because it had been practised in Jerusalem the mother church, long before the conversion of Paul. Churches the

have not elders, and possess the materials described, ought first of all to have them appointed to this office. But let them be chosen with all respect to the apostolic directions, and let them have the authority of scriptural ordination; for when chosen they have much of the destiny of the church in their own hands, and must be submitted to as the Lord directs. We shall keep this subject of discipline before our readers till it be understood, if we can make it intelligible to them all.

A. C.

CO-OPERATION MEETING.

HILLSBOROUGH, Va., November 25, 1839.

Dear brother Campbell—

OUR co-operation meeting in the city of Richmond, from the 8th to the 11th of this month, was better attended than any we have ever had. The notice was too short for all the congregations to send messengers to it. There were messengers and communications from between 20 and 25 congregations. All of them appeared desirous of aiding in sending out evangelists. There was more unity of sentiment in the reports than we have ever heard at such a meeting—indeed there was more love manifested by the disciples of Christ in Richmond, than I have seen for years. I am persuaded such a good spirit will produce some fruit to the glory of God. The great difficulty with us was to get good and efficient evangelists. The following brethren were prevailed on to act for us;—Brethren Coleman, Bagby, and Henshall, in Eastern Virginia. Brother J. D. Ferguson is attending the lectures of the William and Mary College. He will spend every Lord's day, and all spare time, in proclaiming the gospel in Williamsburg, and to the congregations in York and James City. Brethren Goss and M'Gruder will labor in Charlottesville and the region round about. Thus we have united in enlarging the sphere and number of evangelists to convert the world.

Our meeting in Richmond we trust will be productive of much good. Some 8 or 10 have confessed and been immersed—the first since the destructionist doctrine was proclaimed there. Some five or six have been restored and joined by letter. They have increased 17 or 18. Love and union seem now to reign in the Richmond congregation. May their peace never be again disturbed by any speculative theorist! Brother Du Val has determined to move to Richmond: of course they will have his labors statedly. May he prove a Barnabas among them!

We agreed to have another co-operation meeting in Charlottesville, to commence on the Friday before the first Lord's day in May. We wish all the congregations in Virginia to send messengers to this meeting, that we may know the state and progress of the disciples united with us in restoring the ancient gospel and order of things. We do not know our strength in the state, and no wonder those who are watching and praying for our downfall should be ignorant of our standing and progress. We wish you to publish on the cover of your

Harbinger this meeting of all the congregations of worshippers of God in Virginia, who are resolved to build alone upon the teaching of Jesus Christ and his Apostles. We earnestly request that you will be among us at that time. Also, give an invitation to brethren John T. Johnson, D. S. Burnet, A. Crihfield, Challen, or any others, whose piety and usefulness are known among the churches. We think the time is fast approaching when the ancient gospel will triumph over all opposition. We want but two things to make it so—good and efficient Evangelists, and Elders that rule well. Will the brethren from other states and sections of country lend a helping hand at this meeting? We entreat you, brethren, to do so.

I have recently learned, since our meeting in Richmond, that brother Coleman has immersed five or six intelligent and influential persons in the congregation at Antioch; among the number is our much esteemed and hospitable friend P. Woolfolk, and three of his daughters. A more accomplished family I do not know in that section of country. His amiable wife was one of the first of the number in Eastern Virginia who had the independence of character to confess before your then oppressed and persecuted fellow-laborer in the cause of primitive Christianity, and immersed by him I rejoice with her in the fruits of her "work of faith, labor of love, and patience of hope, in our Lord Jesus Christ, in the sight of God and our Father." I also understood that a daughter of our friend Jordan Woolfolk has boldly confessed Jesus and obeyed him in immersion. May these young intelligent disciples prove to be beloved Persises, or Phebes, Priscillas, Loises, or Eunices to the congregation and the rising generation!

We are now moving on in peace and love in our congregation, and our number is gradually increasing.

THOMAS M. HENLEY.

News from the Churches.

Houston, Marion County, Missouri, September 16, 1839.

During this summer I have immersed about twenty-five persons into Jesus Christ, who are now rejoicing in the Lord. EASTHAM BALLINGER.

Montevideo, Elbert County, Georgia, September 24 1839.

The ancient gospel is making some progress in this vicinity, where, until recently, the reign of sectarianism was absolute and uninterrupted. On the first Lord's day in this month, at a meeting of the Disciples near this place, after a very interesting and highly appropriate address from brother Barnes on the occasion, twelve of the brethren, who had been recently immersed upon a profession of their faith, gave each other the right hand of fellowship as a pledge of Christian union in a congregational character. We adopted, as our confession of faith, the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible. On the same day there were two additions by immersion. On the Lord's day following we held a meeting, at which a numerous and highly respectable audience was both interested and edified by the labors of our beloved brethren Moore, Barnes, and Shelnane. On that day we had two additions, so that we now have a church of Christ, at this place, which, in all matters of faith and practice, discards every book except the inspired volume, and every name except those which are sanctioned by the Book. This glorious reformation, I trust, will go on till it ushers in the millennial reign of peace on earth and good will among men.

TINSLEY W. RUCKER.

Decatur, Illinois, September 27, 1839.

The good cause of truth is progressing some in this region. I attended a co-operation meeting with the brethren in Shelby county, Illinois, on Saturday last. The meeting came to a close on Tuesday. We had a happy time. The Disciples were made to rejoice

and sinners to tremble. Twenty-one persons united with the church—sixteen by immersion, and five that had been immersed some time before. Those who confessed followed the example of the Jailor, and were baptized the same hour of the night in which they believed. Brother Tobias Grider was appointed to ride as an Evangelist. We hope the time is not far distant when the Disciples in Illinois will awake from their slumbers, and follow the example of the few churches in Shelby county, and send men into the field to reap the harvest of souls that is ripening in this new and flourishing country. May the good Lord help us to keep the unity of the spirit in the bonds of peace!

Brother W. Rowls has lately immersed about 25 on the Lake Fork of Salt River in Sangamon county. ROBERT FOSTER.

Granville, Bradford county, Pennsyloania, September 30 1839.

The cause of our Redeemer is prospering in this region. On Lord's day, the 22d inst., in the congregation at this place, nine young persons made the good confession. Since that time another has been received who was formerly a Methodist. Brother D Palmer was the principal speaker. The public mind appears to have received a very favorable impression. LUMAN PUTNAM.

Georgetown, Kentucky, October 3, 1839.

I reached home on the 1st instant, after a three weeks' tour. We first went to the annual meeting at Millersburg, where we remained three days. The weather was very disagreeable from almost constant rain until Monday. Only four accessions were made at that time. We spent Tuesday and Wednesday at Carlisle with brethren Hall, J N. Payne, and John Rogers. Only one addition was made there. Brother Hall and myself proceeded to Flemingsburg, where we had engaged to hold a protracted meeting. The cause had never had a fair hearing in that place, and the people were not informed as to the doctrine held by us. We commenced operations under every disadvantage. We had but three brethren in the place, and they were recent converts. The Methodist friends permitted us to occupy their house, with the exception of the two Lord's days and Wednesday evening. On those occasions they had meetings, and of course we took the Court of Justice for the seat of operations. Contrary to all calculations we obtained twenty-three accessions to the good cause, and constituted a congregation of about forty members, who are resolved to act out the doctrine they have professed. The religious folks were in the general, our opposers, while the citizens of the world were our friends and defenders. Much good was done. On the very last day we gained eight additions, notwithstanding the prayers of a sectarian church against us. I was most hospitably and kindly entertained by Mr. Bean and his lady while I was there. We proceeded on Monday morning to Maysville, where we had agreed to meet brother Adams, who had been laboring there from the Friday preceding. He had immersed two aged females. We labored there together until Thursday night, and obtained in all thirteen. I then came over to May's Lick, where I obtained one more on Lord's day. Thus forty-two were added at the above places in three weeks, while other brethren succeeded finely at other places.

JOHN T. JOHNSON.

Charlestown, Indiana, October 18, 1839.

While on a tour through the interior of this state, I met with brothers John and Jacob Wright, in Jackson county, 9 miles south of the county seat, on Monday the 31st ultimo; where, on the Saturday and Lord's day previous they had immersed about six persons. Monday and Tuesday we continued preaching to the people, which resulted in an addition of seventeen, making in all twenty-three. Two weeks previous to this, however, brethren John and Jacob Wright had, at a protracted meeting at the same place, immersed eighteen—whole number at both meetings forty-one.

On Tuesday night brother Jacob Wright and myself commenched preaching in Brownstown, (the county seat.) On Wednesday night we addressed them again; but on Thursday night, from previous appointment, the house was occupied by a Methodist Episcopal preacher, and on Friday he delivered two discourses on baptism. On Saturday I delivered an address in reply to his efforts on baptism, with good effect. Early on Lord's day morning I was informed that we denied the "operation of the Holy Spirit." At 11 o'clock I delivered a discourse on that subject, at the close of which five or six made the good confession. We continued proclaiming the gospel, day and night, until Thursday morning, 10 o'clock; enlisting in all 38 or 39 willing converts, of as respectable citizens as that country affords. Before leaving we constituted a church of about 48 members, including several brethren in the vicinity of the place. Bless the Lord, the gospel is triumphing gloriously. May the good Lord bless the young disciples! M. COLE.

Norton, Portage county, Ohio, December 11, 1839.

Last evening I baptized two persons; one of them was a Methodist preacher, by the name of Moore, who lately moved into our neighborhood, a most bitter enemy to the Disciples. He came out to hear me one evening, calculating to oppose me if I did not preach to suit him; but he *received a death-wound.* He immediately desisted preaching for seven weeks. Since that time he has been a diligent student of the Bible, and the result was that he came and asked me to baptize him. There is no small stir among the people here. He has been a preacher among the Methodists for 11 years—riding the circuit for a number of years. He bids fair to be a useful man in the kingdom of Jesus Christ our Lord. A. B. GREEN.

Boone county, Missouri, October 20, 1839.

On Friday the 11th inst. our annual meeting commenced in Fulton; it was numerously attended by the brethren and sisters, besides vast crowds of friends, who generally listened with deep interest and attention. The brethren generally dispersed on Monday, but the meeting continued until Tuesday. Six confessed and submitted to Jesus, and many others seemed to be almost persuaded to be Christians. The churches in the counties of Callaway, Boon, Howard, Randolph, Monroe, Audrain, and Cole, have had about 400 additions during the past year, and the number of their members are about 1800. The Methodists were kind enough to open their meeting-house for our accommodation. The preachers who were present at the meeting were B. W Stone, J. P. Lancaster, S F Jones, M. P. Wills, W Woodson, Jos. Coons, A Rice, Ja. Coons, D. Davies, ——— Doughlass, T. M. Allen, W. White and W. Reed.

Several preachers in the above mentioned counties did not attend the meeting; it is to be hoped that more punctuality on their part will hereafter be found. The next annual meeting is appointed to be held in Fayette, Howard county, and is to commence on Friday before the first Lord's day in October, 1840.

Either verbal or written communications were received from the following churches, viz —

Churches.	*County.*	*No. of Members.*	*Increase last year.*
1 Antioch,	Callaway,	60	32
2 Mount Tabor,	Ditto,	33	33
3 Fulton,	Ditto,	107	10
4 Millersburg,	Ditto,	96	24
5 Columbia,	Boon,	91	19
6 Persia,	Ditto,	74	12
7 Bear Creek,	Ditto,	71	27
8 Friendship,	Ditto,	63	31
9 Rocheport,	Ditto,	98	25
10 Rockbridge,	Ditto,	43	13
11 Fayette,	Howard,	90	16
12 Freedom,	Ditto,	42	12
13 Mount Pleasant,	Ditto,	60	25
14 Richland,	Ditto,	120	25
15 Salt Creek,	Ditto,	85	10
16 Mount Moriah,	Ditto,	40	8
17 Paris,	Monroe,	140	30
18 Elk Fork,	Ditto,	73	7
19 Florida,	Ditto,	46	8
20 Santa-Fee,	Ditto,	16	—
21 Crooked Creek,	Ditto,	28	4
22 Union,	Randolph,	17	—
23 Dover,	Ditto,	88	34
24 Antioch,	Ditto,	50	21
25 Dack's Prairie,	Ditto,	75	20
26 Muddy,	Ditto,	22	—
27 Jefferson City,	Cole,	20	10
28 Loutre,	Audrain,	12	12
29 Shelbyville,	Shelby,	17	17
30 Red Top,	Boon,	50	5

The information from some of the churches was rather imperfect. Should there be errors, it is hoped the friends will correct them. Trusting the above information will be acceptable to the Christian public, it is respectfully submitted. T. M. ALLEN.

Bourbon county, Kentucky, October 2, 1839

I have just closed a meeting in Trimble county, two miles from Madison, Indiana, on the Kentucky side: where I found a company of some 25 disciples, having lately constituted themselves into a church upon the *Book*. I obtained a hearing for thirteen days in succession, in conjunction with brother Newton Short, of Indiana, who joined me the day after the meeting commenced. We succeeded in adding 51 soldiers to the army of the faithful—35 by confession and immersion, and the balance from the sects. Bless the Lord that the truth is his mighty power in converting sinners! and the people are beginning to see it and feel it. May the Lord give you great consolation in hearing and seeing the triumphs of his word! is the prayer of your unworthy fellow-laborer in the Lord's vineyard. CURTIS J. SMITH.

Shade Township, Somerset County, Pa. September 21, 1839.

We regret that we have never given you any knowledge of our little body. We have been very much refreshed by a visit from brother George H Caldwell. We commenced a meeting on Saturday the 14th inst. which continued till Thursday following; during which time twenty-five made the good confession, and were immersed into Jesus as their lawgiver. We number at this time 64, and still prospects are good. We have continued to meet on every Lord's day to attend to the apostolic teaching. We rejoice, dear brother, that the cause of truth progresses even here near the mountains.

We have no Elders set apart.

SAMUEL HUNTER,
JOHN BERKBELE.

Wellsville, Ohio, October 28, 1839.

I give you an account of the advancement of the good cause in Columbiana county:—On the third Saturday, Sunday, and Monday of the preent month, brother Vanvores and myself held a meeting at Hanover, in this county, where fourteen persons renounced sin and obeyed the Lord of life and glory. The cause is truly gaining ground in that region At the same time brethren Bosworth and Henry held a meeting at Fairfield, at which nineteen obeyed in baptism. A few days previous to the above meetings brother Vanvorhes immersed eight persons at Franklin, in Carroll county; and the same brother lately immersed nine in the neighborhood of Wellsville.

MAHLON MARTIN.

Postscript—Brethren Bosworth and Vanvores held a meeting at Norristown, nine miles south of Hanover, on the Lord's day before the meeting at Hanover; at which ten were immersed.

Austintown, Ohio, December 5, 1839.

I take this opportunity to inform you that I set out in the month of October last, to hold a few meetings with the brethren in this part of the world, and had the misfortune to have my ankle bone put out of place the very first day. Our first meeting was in Fairfield, Columbiana county. Brother Bosworth was present. Nineteen obeyed the gospel. The second meeting was in Sharon, and ten obeyed The third was in Hartford, where six obeyed. The fourth was in Southington, where eleven obeyed and two received on confession, and five were added to our congregation since the third Lord's day in October. So from the above date I have seen fifty three confess the Lord.

Brother Hartzell was at Sharon; Brother Applegate at Hartford; and brother Brocket at Southington. But as Job once said to some friends, 'Miserable preachers are we all!' Could we have had one good proclaimer, such as some of whom our brethren in Kentucky speak, we might have converted a thousand.

JOHN HENRY.

Brother Henry, of Ohio, once objected to giving any account of his labors, or of those of the brethren with him, because of the various commendations and encomiums given to the talents and eloquence of men in other regions, and has taken the above method to reprove this error. I have no doubt he is correct in his views. "Who is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom you have believed, *as the Lord gave to every man?*' There have been too many allusions to great men and great talents It is disgusting to many sensible, pious, and excellent persons, and a great snare to young men. I know more than a simple plurality of young men whom I have injured in this way. They soon became proud, dogmatical, and lifted up beyond measure I have been severely chastised for it, and will endeavor to amend my ways in this particular.

But this is but half the error. The puffing business is not confined to the press. It is the burthen of table-talk, of fire-side parlance among the brethren, and even on the Lord's day there is sometimes more said about the good preacher, and the fine speech, than about the piety, the morality, and the excellency of the Christian doctrine and manner of life.

This being the beginning of the year 1840, I propose to speak much more about the exemplary piety, morality, and general amiability of our fellow-laborers, than of their fine talents and eloquent sermons; and thus to give more glory to God, and less honor to man. The treasure is still in earthly vessels, that the excellency of the power might be of God, and not of men. A. C.

North Middletown, Kentucky, December 8, 1839.

In my letter to you, dated the 27th September, containing statistical information relative to the churches and *Christians* in this county, and published on page 532, No, 11; vol. 3d. M. H. new series; from misrepresentation I have erred in one or two important points.

First, I must add an additional church to the number already reported in the county—namely: —

Antioch—members, about 100; Elders, John Giltner and William Brown; Deacons, Peter Troutman, Jacob Hutzell, George Harp, and John M. Taylor; Preacher, John A. Gano.

Deacons at Cooper's Run, William Stamps. William Barton. Stephen L. and Charles T. Garrard. Officers at Leesburg, are Elders Joseph Wasson, James M'Hatton, Paschal Tinsly and William M'Millan. Deacons, Lewis Coppage, James H. Shropshire, Wm. Bodkin. James Arnet and John D. Thomas.

At Union, Elders George W. Williams and J. E Gano. Deacons, Thompson Ware, J. Sidner, James Hurst and Samuel Bryant.

The congregations at Leesburg and Union have each of them large, convenient, and new brick houses, entirely their own. In the church at Cane Ridge Thomas Bledsoe should be classed as a Deacon, and not as a Preacher.

At Millersburg it should be Joshua, instead of Joseph Irvin. He also proclaims the gospel there once-a-month. The two latter are errors of yours, and not mine.

As now corrected, the number of churches situate in the county will be nine instead of eight, and the total number of members 1535, including the half of two others, located on the line, as before reported. N. L. LINDSAY.

Moulton, Alabama, November 11, 1839.

There are several congregations of Christians in this section. We hope to be able to give the statistics next year. I have no help as evangelist in all this quarter, and a good door is opened for laborers. I have, in the three months I have been riding, immersed 129. Some others, perhaps 20, have united from the Baptists, &c. We need laborers here exceedingly. We have, comparatively, nothing to do but correct misrepresentations. Their misrepresentations &c are untellable, and almost incredible if told. It is with us here no more to be wondered at, that they misrepresent, garble, and misapply the word of the Lord. Lord, grant us patience, courage, &c.

C. KENDRICK.

New Albany, Indiana, December 10, 1839.

Permit me to inform your readers that you addressed a large and attentive audience in our city, on Thursday the 4th of last month; again at night, at which time 7 respectable persons confessed their Lord and were immersed the same hour of the night.

The next Lord's day brother Newton Short preached, and continued every night, including the next Lord's day, for ten nights; during which time 9 respectable persons were immersed, and two were added; making 18 additions, including those when you were here. We have had 31 additions since the first of September last

May 19th, 1835, we had 43 members. We have now 343 names, from which we take 133 which we have commended away and put away from the congregation which leaves our present number 210.

We have a comfortable brick meeting-house, 60 by 40 feet.

Brethren J S. Ashton, Thomas Vaughn, and D. G. Stewart are the present bishops of the congregation.

The disciples here are living in love and peace. May the God of love and peace continue to be with us! D. G. STEWART.

N. B. There is no other church of our brethren regularly organized in this county. There are a few brethren at Greenville who may organize soon. D. G. S.

Georgetown, Kentucky, November 18, 1839.

I have been laboring in Georgetown and its vicinity for the last four or five weeks, and the result has been an addition of between 30 and 40 to the congregations Besides this, the congregations are in most excellent spirits and order, and have assumed an imposing stand for the better. May the Lord bless you in the work of faith, the labor of love, and perseverance of hope! J. T JOHNSON.

N. B. I was at Beasly near four days, and 15 additions (as well as I recollect) were made. The prospects were fine for more. I left brothers Moss and Enos Campbell there. I shall return with brother Ricketts in a day or so from this. Brother Ricketts has delivered several able addresses here, to the great gratification of the brethren and friends, and several have confessed J. T. J.

Georgetown, Kentucky, December 12, 1839.

We have just closed a four days' meeting held by brother Ricketts, much to the edification of the brethren and to the gratification of all his hearers. We had a faithful hearing, and the public mind was much enlightened. We had the pleasure to hear the confession of four persons during the meeting. Thus we were greatly encouraged to labor on. Among these was the estimable Mrs Willis, of whom I spoke to you the other day at May's Lick, the daughter of Mr. Cohen, the learned Jew of Richmond, Va., with whom you conversed while there on the convention, some years past. It was most exciting to the brethren when she united with us. May the Lord bless her and those with whom she is associated by the ties of kindred, is my most ardent prayer.

J. T. JOHNSON

THOUGHTS ON EVIDENCE—*No. II.*

I NOTICED in my last the popular notion that religion is a certain, or rather an uncertain, tangible, visible, or sensible something, which can be perceived and enjoyed only through an operation upon the senses or the feelings, constituting what is called a "living or evangelical faith." The direct tendency of this doctrine is to set aside, as of no value, that faith which arises from the written testimony of the Prophets and Apostles; and which, as defined by Paul, is "the confidence of things *hoped for*; the evidence of things *not seen*." It renders

necessary, then, a new definition of the term *faith*, which does really, according to this view, signify nothing less than feeling, knowledge, or experience. Thus the words of scripture are made to express ideas directly the reverse of those for which they stand in the sacred volume.

I could not more charitably account for the origin of this view of religion, than by attributing it to a desire of securing in its behalf a species of evidence (that of sense) which is supposed to be superior to every other. The attempt indeed has not succeeded; for after all that has been said upon sensible and spiritual operations, both the subject of them himself and his spiritual guides are frequently at a loss to decide upon their validity. It requires a *tactus eruditus* to settle this question, and ascertain by the spiritual pulse whether or not the heart be affected. Some religious teachers profess, indeed, to be highly skilled in this way. One of them asserted lately in a public discourse upon this subject, that one of his brethren had had religion for twenty years, and never knew it until he, the preacher, assured him of it. But all do not possess this knowledge. *Non omnia possumus omnes*, as Virgil says. So that the matter of conversion remains mysterious and uncertain, feeling and experience to the contrary notwithstanding.

Still the opinion upon which I have supposed this doctrine to be founded, to wit, that no evidence can equal that of sense, prevails almost universally; and as it exerts an injurious influence in many cases, it deserves to be particularly examined. Men, indeed, are so little acquainted with the nature and comparative value of evidence, that they are liable to be whirled about by every wind of doctrine. Yet it will be found, upon the whole, that new systems of religion will be successful in proportion as their authors bring to their support the evidence of sense. Many there were who, at the breaking out of Mormonism, believed in it in preference to Christianity, because, as they remarked, there were four *living* witnesses to vouch for the Book of Mormon; whereas all the original witnesses for the authenticity of the Bible were long since dead.

I cannot but attribute much of the prevalent wavering incredulity respecting written testimony to the epithet *probable*, which the schoolmen in the plenitude of their wisdom have been pleased to attach, by way of distinction, to the evidence of moral reasoning. 'Deductive evidence,' say they, 'is of two kinds—*moral* or *probable*, and *demonstrative*.' The evidence, then, upon which religion and morality rest; nay, the proof of all facts and events for which we have not the direct evidence of sense or consciousness, and of all those general truths deduced by induction from observation and experience, is by them denominated *probable*. While, at the same time, as though to invalidate it still more, the evidence relating to subjects of a fixed and

immutable nature, such as geometry and arithmetic, is termed in contradistinction, *demonstrative*. They do not, indeed, neglect to inform us that they mean to distinguish by the word probable the *kind* and not the *degree* of evidence; and that it includes not only every *subordinate* degree of moral evidence, but also the *highest*. Nevertheless, it follows inevitably that a word so constantly used in common discourse to denote doubt and uncertainty, will convey in some degree the same meaning even in its technical use. The very selection of such an adjective implies dubiety; for the English language is by no means so barren as not to afford a better one. In consequence of this blunder, the impression has been made very generally that moral reasonings and evidences are more doubtful than any other; that mathematical reasoning is much more conclusive, and the evidence of sense incomparably more so. Hence it was that Clarke wrote his celebrated mathematical "Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God," supposing that he was bringing to the aid of religion a higher species of evidence.

Such an attempt, however, was no less unnecessary than abortive. It was unnecessary, because the proof of his propositions by other evidence was equal to any demonstration. It was abortive, because that species of evidence was wholly inapplicable. One might as well attempt to prove by mathematical reasoning that Jesus of Nazareth is the Son of God and the propitiation for our sins. Yet one might as rationally doubt any one of Euclid's demonstrations as the truth of these propositions. Indeed it is not likely that such a mode of proof would ever have been thought of, but for these distinctions and divisions of the schools, and which have been for the most part so technical and artificial that they have tended as much to create error and confusion as they have aided the memory of the student. Classification or arrangement is nevertheless necessary and useful when it is sufficiently simple and natural; and we shall accordingly, in the further prosecution of the subject, find it advantageous to consider our ideas, impressions, or convictions as derived from three sources;—1st. *The external senses.* 3d. *Internal consciousness.* And 3d. *Oral or written testimony.* The object in view is to ascertain whether or not it be true that the evidence of oral or written testimony is less conclusive than that of sense or consciousness; and, if it be so, in what respects and under what circumstances.

One or two things, however, I wish in the first place to notice. It has been usual to consider *memory* as a distinct source of evidence. It appears to me incorrect so to regard it, at least in the acceptation in which the five senses or consciousness are sources of evidence. No ideas can be *communicated* to us through the memory, as they are through the senses or consciousness. It may be to us an evidence

that we once came to certain conclusions in the exercise of our senses or in our reasonings. It can be no evidence for the truth or correctness of these conclusions. Whether it have recorded merely the conclusions themselves, or have noted down the original evidence by which we arrived at such conclusions, in neither case has it supplied us with any thing which might be properly regarded as evidence of their truth. As well might we suppose that the recording of the deed gave a valid title to a certain piece of property, and that by making out a deed and having it recorded we could convey an estate in which we had neither interest nor right. Our memory stands in pretty much the same relation to our conclusions as written testimony does to the facts which it records. Written testimony is memory copied, transcribed, or transferred to paper. In this respect indeed there is no real difference between written testimony and that which is oral. Oral testimony is, in like manner, but memory, or the ideas registered by memory expressed in words spoken. Neither our own memories, nor the writings or oral testimony of others can be to us original evidence. It is their province to state and detail original evidences, or record the conclusions derived therefrom. By original evidence I mean *sensible* evidence; for it is obvious that our senses and consciousness exercised upon their appropriate objects alone furnish us with direct and immediate proof of their existence and qualities. I make this remark that the subject may be fairly presented. Let it be noted, however, here, as we may show more fully hereafter, that original evidences are not invalidated by being recorded, reported, or remembered. We have just stated that nothing is thereby added to their credibility, but it is just as certain that nothing is thereby detracted from it. Circumstances may affect the correctness of the record, report, or remembrance; but this is a different question. So far as this record, report, or remembrance is correct, it has not rendered the original evidences less credible by transmitting them.

I would observe also that I have no wish to be understood as placing oral or written testimony *above* the senses or consciousness as a means of acquiring a knowledge of truth. When I say that sensible evidence is *not superior*, I do not say that it is *inferior*. No evidence can be in the nature of things superior to that of sense or consciousness. Memory can but record this evidence: oral and written testimony can but detail and present it. But I would say that memory and oral and written testimony may be fully equal in credibility to the senses or to consciousness. They must be of necessity equal so far as they furnish a correct report, and we will show that circumstances affect the correctness of impressions made through the senses, as well as that of those received from oral and written testimony. R. R.

THE CIRCULATION OF THE HARBINGER.

The circulation of the Harbinger is, indeed, quite respectable, and has always been so; but it is not by any means what it might have been, or what it could be made, were either its Editor or its friends to be as zealous and as industrious in this point as in some others; and as I myself, as a matter of course, think we ought to be. I have never been importunate on this ground, and I do not think have used more than half the means ordinarily used, and which I might have used, and now believe I ought to have used in behalf of this object.

I have felt that my power to do good in all the places that I have ever visited, has been, without an exception, so far as remembered, usually in the ratio of my readers. Where there are few or no readers, little or nothing can be done The people are all asleep, or filled with prejudice, or wholly indifferent on the subject of reform. It requires, in such places, a series of efforts, and a considerable time, to make any impression. The press has, in this reformation, pioneered the way. Before there was an evangelist in the field at all, the press had broken up the fallow ground, and prepared the soil over a large surface, on which the labors of our first evangelists told so well, and made so favorable an impression.

My southern tour last winter cured me effectually of that false modesty which had very much prevented me from soliciting readers to our periodicals. I saw at once the necessity not only of lighting a candle, but of putting it on a stand. I am fully convinced that it is necessary to be diligent in getting readers, as it is to be in writing in behalf of the Bible and Bible truth. I have therefore resolved to attempt a more extensive reading of the Christian Baptist and of this work. Brother Burnet has been at much pains and expense in stereotyping that work, for which he has not been fully remunerated, and the work is now in metal, standing comparatively still. It is indeed *stereotyped!* And tens of thousands might be supplied with it at a very reasonable price, if proper means were employed to get it introduced. And have not the *whole brotherhood* repeatedly expressed a conviction that this work has been most acceptable and puissant in breaking up the way—adapted, indeed, better than any other to the actual conditions of society under sectarianism—because of the many essays from so many pens in that work, and adapted to an incipient state of things? And have we not much new ground yet to cultivate?

As to the Harbinger, new and extra pains shall be taken to adapt it to the present state of things—as respects *babes in Christ*, *young men* and *fathers in Israel*. We will therefore request every sincere friend of reformation as plead on our pages—*every constant and interested reader*, to get one or more subscribers for the work, and forward them for the year 1840.

We commence a new *decade* of years. May the *forties* greatly transcend the *thirties* and the *twenties* in the good deeds and rapid progress of reformation! It was in 1820 we had the first public debate on the principles of reform, and we have yet the memoranda of ten preceding years of effort in the cause. We desire to commence the *forties* with a new impetus: for the prophecies lead us to expect greater events in the *forties* than have transpired not only since the 19th century began, but for centuries before. We ask all agents, and friends, and readers to give us more sea—to get more readers, and we shall endeavor to make their efforts not vain in the Lord. A. C.

THE NAME.

When our Scribes and Elders shall have written six months on *the name* by which they *will* be called, I will only ask the liberty of simply reporting progress, and asking leave to sit again: by which I only mean to say, that if I am convinced of any error in my reasons offered, I will report it faithfully. In the absence of which, I wish it to be understood that my conclusions yet remain as they are now expressed. A. C.

OBITUARY NOTICES.

It is my painful duty to record at one time the loss of three truly estimable and beloved citizens of the kingdom of the Messiah, all personally known to myself. The first of these, that of Elder *Chauncey Forward*, of Somerset, Pa., was merely noted before, as our sheet was going to press. I expected then a biographical sketch of this truly excellent and useful man; or, at least, a fuller communication on the subject of his demise. What may have appeared elsewhere I know not, as I have been absent for some time; but the following brief, but comprehensive tribute to his memory, is all that I have seen in print. It is from a political paper, published in Somerset, Pa., and in the following words:—

"Died, in this borough, on Wednesday morning last, the 9th November, of inflammation of the stomach, the Hon. *Chauncey Forward*, aged about 46 years.——The death of Mr. Forward is a public loss. No man was more highly and universally esteemed in the circle of his acquaintance. He has filled several important public trusts, to the entire satisfaction of his constituents He represented this district several years in the House of Representatives, and in the Senate of this State, and five years in the Congress of the United States. He also performed the duties of Prothonotary, Register, Recorder, and Clerk of the several Courts of this county for several years, with an ability and accuracy that elicited universal praise. As an Attorney at Law, he stood at the head of one of the most able bars in the interior of Pennsylvania. In short, as an officer, a citizen, a gentleman, a husband, a father, and a friend, he had no superior in this part of the state. And what is best of all, he was a faithful and devoted Christian. Peace to his ashes!"

The above is as unexaggerated and as unvarnished an obituary notice as I recollect to have read for a long time. But if there can be any thing better said of a man than that he was "a faithful and devoted Christian," I would say something better still—He was an intelligent, able, and successful preacher of the gospel of Christ as delivered to us in the scriptures of truth. He resigned his seat in Congress because he thought he could honor his Saviour better by staying at home, than by sitting in deliberation upon the temporalities of the nation; and at the sacrifice of both time and money, labored much in the work of the Lord. But, perhaps, there is nothing better that can be said of any man than that he was "*a faithful Christian:*" for a faithful Christian will use all his talents for the Lord in the best possible way. We have lost a good and great man; but our loss is temporal—his gain is eternal. A. C.

My acquaintance with our departed sister *Monroe*, of New York, fully sustains the following notice of her death by Elder Barker, a part of which only we can find room for:—

"Died, in the city of New York, on Monday evening, the 18th of November, 1839, in the full hope of immortality and eternal life through our Lord Jesus Christ, *Catharine*, wife of *Daniel Monroe*, aged 52 years. The deceased was immersed about 32 years ago by Elder Archibald Maclay, and continued a member of the Mulberry street church for about 25 years During this quarter of a century (the writer has frequently been informed) sister Monroe was always punctual in her attendance on worship, and took a warm interest in the cause of Zion, especially that branch of it over which Elder Maclay was Pastor, and filled the several social relations in life with a degree of punctuality seldom surpassed. In March, 1833, sister Monroe, with her husband, left the Mulberry street church, and united with the church in Laurens street, and continued a member of the same up to the day of her death, a period of nearly 7 years. During that time she was never known to be absent at the regular meetings of the brethren, except in case of sickness or some other necessary detention. Sister Monroe, in all her moral, social, and religious engagements, was most punctual, and possessed in an eminent degree the confidence of all her associates both in and out of the church."

From a private note from Wheeling, Va., we learn that at 3 o'clock on the morning of the 19th ult., after a few days' severe illness, borne with the most exemplary composure, fell asleep in the confident expectation of a blessed resurrection, sister *Trendly*, wife of brother Frederick Trendly, of Wheeling. From the day that she vowed submission to the Lord by an immersion into his death, she endeavored to walk in all newness of life, to the utmost of her ability, always exercising a conscience without offence to God and man. She expressed all assurance that her divine Saviour would present her before the throne of her Father's glory with exceeding joy; and therefore most triumphantly overcame the fear of death and of the grave.

"How sweet to die, with Jesus nigh,
The Rock of our Salvation."

SINGULAR COINCIDENCE.

Departed this life, the last week in November, 1839, in Nelson county, Ky.—

Mrs. Summers, aged about	90
Mrs. Aud,	90
Mrs Suderck,	100
Mrs. Rector,	83
Mrs. Patrick,	80
	433

leaving some hundreds of descendants. How many days and nights of watchfulness, of pain, and affliction have these venerable old mothers endured. They were wives of the men of the American revolution. Some of them experienced the dangers of the Indian tomahawk and scalping-knife in the first settlement of Kentucky. They were the links that bound the present to the past generation. For nearly half a century the professors of religion, they have gone to their heavenly rest, and their works do follow them.

Kentucky paper.

The Hygeia Female Atheneum, near Cincinnati.

Having purchased the farm which the late O. M. Spencer, Esq., selected for his family residence, situated on the new Hamilton turnpike, eight miles northwest of Cincinnati in the midst of the garden of the county, and about 400 feet above the Ohio, I propose to open there a Female Institution, on the first Monday in February, 1840.

My buildings, as it regards size, construction, and beauty and healthfulness of site, are admirably adapted to such a purpose. Few changes will be necessary. The position is remarkably favorable for an institution of learning. Several lines of daily coaches pass within one hundred and twenty yards of the house, and reach the city in less than an hour. The contiguity to the city furnishes the finest opportunity to secure the best instructers in the ornamental branches of education in the Union. The pleasant village, Mount Healthy, also called Mount Pleasant, is about a mile and a half off, in full view. An extended lawn will afford ample scope for exercise. It is intended, while all proper regard shall be had to the accomplishments of the age, that the school shall be supremely devoted to a substantial education, and to the formation of a sound moral character. The preparation of our pupils for usefulness is our object; but this object we deem impracticable without the moral principles of Christianity. Therefore, the Bible is one of our principal school-books. The library will consist of about five hundred volumes.

The first session will be one of five months, from the first Monday in February till the last Friday in June Terms—One hundred dollars in advance, or two hundred dollars per annum. This sum includes all expences of board, washing, and tuition of a full English and scientific course. The elements of the ancient languages, French, drawing, and the various kinds of instrumental music, &c. will be charged the usual prices. Day scholars, (i. e. net boarders,) $25 per session, or $50 per annum. Boys under 12 years of age will be received at the same rates.

Address D. S. BURNET,
Mount Healthy, Hamilton county, Ohio.

August 1, 1839.

☞ Brother Burnet's character, intellectual, literary, and moral, is so well and so favorably known, not only to our brethren, but very generally throughout the community of our widely extended readers, as to need no commendation. I am only sorry that one so eminently qualified to be useful on a large scale as an Evangelist, either in Europe or America, should be confined to the labors of either a public or a private Academy. A. C.

OUR NEW LITERARY AND MORAL INSTITUTION.

Our sketch of a new Literary and Moral Institution has been universally approbated in all corners of the land, and calls for its development are multiplying on our hand. I shall therefore in our next number enter upon its details. Institutions for forming human character, for moulding nature according to a divine model, are demanded by the spirit of the age—by the wants of the church—by the anticipations of a new era, which are every where impressing themselves upon the attention and upon the affections of the reading and thinking community. Our views, as soon as possible, shall be submitted to the consideration of our readers. A. C.

☞ Various communications have been deferred—one on Scepticism—one on Church Edification Various interesting Queries have been received. For which we shall make room as soon as possible.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

NEW SERIES.

VOLUME IV.—NUMBER II.

BETHANY, VA. *FEBRUARY*, 1840.

THE CALUMNIES
OF
R. W. LANDIS,

Minister of a Presbyterian Congregation, Jeffersonville, Pa.

ALL efforts having failed to obtain from Mr. Landis or Dr. Peters any acknowledgment of the false and malicious charges printed and published both in this country and Great Britain against me; I am now, in justice to myself and the community to which I belong, compelled to appeal to the first court having jurisdiction in the case. I not only wrote to Dr. Peters two or three times, but waited on him in the person of a friend in New York, demanding, if not an insertion of my Review in the American Biblical Repository, an acknowledgment of the outrage they had committed against me. The only answer received was a verbal declaration that it was not their custom to publish such communications, and that my Review was too personal for their taste—as if Mr. Landis had not been personal beyond any piece ever printed in any respectable Review, even in the said Repository itself. I also sent copies of my Review to Mr. Landis as well as to Dr. Peters, and have not yet received the first indication of repentance for their rash and unwarrantable assaults upon my reputation. I therefore, in the first place, forward my appeal to the Presbytery to which Mr. Landis belongs, in hopes that their action in the case will make farther proceedings on my part unnecessary:—

To the Presbytery of Philadelphia, or whatever Presbytery has spiritual jurisdiction over R. W. LANDIS, Minister, of Jeffersonville, Pennsylvania—the Appeal of ALEXANDER CAMPBELL, of Bethany, Virginia, most respectfully and religiously setteth forth and petitioneth—

GENTLEMEN—

Be it known to you, that I have, in my judgment, just cause of complaint to Heaven and you, against your brother Minister, Mr. R.

W. Landis, of Jeffersonville, Pa., because of certain false and malicious charges printed and published in the January and April numbers of the American Biblical Repository for 1839, calculated to injure my moral and Christian character, so far as Mr. Landis their author, and the Biblical Repository their publisher, are accredited. I would have you to understand, gentlemen, this case fully, and have herewith sent you my Review of said publications that you may appreciate the peculiar grievances of which I complain.

I complain not to you, gentlemen, of what he has said about my views or reasonings concerning faith, repentance, regeneration, baptism, or the Holy Spirit. He has, indeed, on these points greatly misrepresented and distorted my sentiments and writings; but these affect not my moral character with the community—they wound not my reputation for honesty and fair dealing; nor would I trouble your venerable body with the still more wicked and outrageous attempts at fastening upon me the infamy of Unitarianism; which, with the orthodox and your petitioner, is no better than deism; a faith, or rather an unbelief, which you will readily perceive from the evidences laid before you, belongs not to me—a calumny wholly gratuitous and unprovoked by any thing I have ever said, preached, or written. Oppressive and grievous as such reproaches are, especially this last, they shrink into comparative insignificance in the presence of his attack upon my moral honesty as contemplated in relation to a subject of the most solemn concern. He affirms, without any proof whatever, that I have, knowingly and wittingly, and with intention to deceive, for mercenary purposes too, printed, published, and sold sundry large editions of a new translation of the New Testament, under the name and title of a work completed by Drs. George Campbell, James Macknight, and Philip Doddridge, while in fact it was not their work, but my own. I refer you to the accompanying documents, pages 513, 520, for his own words and for the facts in the case; also, to the January and April numbers of the aforesaid Biblical Repository.

Now, gentlemen, this could not be a simple mistake, or a doubtful matter, inasmuch as Mr. Landis either examined the five diverse editions of the work printed before his notices of it, or he did not. If he did not, it was inexcusable and wilful slander of a very daring character; and if he did, and then presumptuously affirmed it, with the very title-page in his eye, it is, as I verily believe, slander malicious and wicked in the superlative degree.

It is impossible for him, on even a superficial examination of the editions extant of this work, to defend himself from wilful and mischievous falsehood, in my candid judgment and unfeigned belief; and

I doubt not it will so appear to you on a careful examination of his *allegata* and *probata*.

But, gentlemen, I belong not to your community, it is true: this, however, precludes me not from an appeal to your judgment-seat. I am a man, an American citizen, and a professor, a firm believer, and defender of the Christian religion both against infidels and Roman Catholics, as this community very well knows. I endeavor to exercise myself righteously according to the laws of our common Lord, and to keep a conscience void of offence towards God and man; and I have as good a right to your protection, in this case, from the violence and malice of one of your body, as an American citizen would have in England from any outrage committed by one of her Majesty's subjects against him. I therefore humbly conceive you are in duty bound to hear, examine, and judge this matter.

The controversy here is not about political rights—about rights of property—nor about opinions; but about *moral character*. I only ask you to examine the whole case with that candor and honesty, with which, in a similar occurrence, you would desire the community to which I belong to act towards you, were our positions to each other exchanged.

I do not wish to appeal to any other tribunal till you have disposed of this appeal. I have no desires of vengeance to gratify. I wish to injure no man. I only desire to have the same public informed, through the same channel in which my good name has been most grievously slandered; or, in the absence of that, to have your decision of the case announced in the length and breadth of the land.

I have, in every way that my reason and judgment could suggest, sought at the hand of Absalom Peters, D. D., a redress of the wrongs he too has done me by endorsing for the truth of documents which he seems never to have seen, or known any thing about. He has treated all my overtures and appeals with neglect; and on a personal application of my friends in New York, has positively refused to make any amends—excusing himself, that 'it was not according to custom,' and that my 'Review was too personal'—when in fact it is by no means so personal as that of Mr. Landis.

But he is not within your jurisdiction. Mr. Landis is. And, gentlemen, you are, you say, a *court of Jesus Christ*, who taught all his followers to do unto all men as they would wish all men to do to them. Your character and that of your party alike demand your immediate and just action on this matter. You have a character to sustain before heaven and earth—before saints and sinners; and you can neither slight nor reject my appeal with impunity. I have, however, a better

opinion of you than to imagine you would pollute your conscience, or hazard your character by a refusal of my appeal. I demand, then, in the name of our common profession, a fair, full, and prompt examination and decision of this matter, as you will have to answer for it to the American people, and to the Judge of the living and the dead.

Very respectfully and benevolently, your friend,

A. CAMPBELL.

BETHANY, VA., January 6, 1840.

SCEPTICISM.

LETTERS TO B——, A SCEPTIC—*No. IX.*

My dear Friend,

AFTER a long silence I again resume my pen to address you. I promised in my last to give you a more pleasant picture whenever I should write you again. As the subject of my present communication I shall lay before you that familiar but beautiful portion of the *sacred volume*, the 19th Psalm:—

"The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handy work. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge. There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world. In them hath he set a tabernacle for the sun; which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race. His going forth is from the end of the heaven, and his circuit unto the ends of it: and there is nothing hid from the heat thereof. The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul: the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple: The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart: the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes: the fear of the Lord is clean, enduring for ever: the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether. More to be desired are they than gold; yea, than much fine gold; sweeter also than honey and the honey-comb. Moreover, by them is thy servant warned: and in keeping them there is great reward. Who can understand his errors? Cleanse thou me from secret faults. Keep back thy servant also from presumptuous sins; let them not have dominion over me: then shall I be upright, and I shall be innocent from the great transgression. Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart, be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord, my strength and my redeemer."

Were we to make the inquiry of all the family of man, 'What earthly consideration is dearest to them?' I am of opinion that we should receive but *one answer* from the million of millions!! It would be, "*The sight of the eyes.*" But if we ask again, 'Why is the *sight of the eyes*

so precious?' or, 'Why set such a value on this gift?' would not an answer equally unanimous be given—"The eye owes all its value to the existence of light." Take away *light* from the world, and the eye is no more precious than the hand, or the foot. It is the wonderful adaptation of the *eye to light*, and of *light to the eye*, that makes *it* the most precious of all earthly possessions.

We will, then, for a little while, inquire into the existence and properties of light. And first—What do we owe to the existence of light? or, rather, What do we *not owe?* Every thing that makes life desirable, or even to be endured; yea, even the barest means of perpetuating *life itself*, we owe to the benign agency of that great and universal dispenser of blessings—the light of heaven!! All that is dismal and horrible the mind associates with the idea of a state where "eternal darkness" reigns. Even the imagination itself revolts at the state of things but barely mentioned as existing on our globe,

"*E're burst the first rich stream of* light
From Chaos' dreary night;—

e're "the Almighty surveyed the dark abyss, and fixed bounds to the several divisions of Nature." Do we choose to heighten the dismal picture already in the imagination, we may add the discoveries of modern geologists (whether real or pretended) of the existence of winged monsters, monstrous and hideous in shape and dimensions, flitting their way amid the dismal gloom! But how is the mind relieved at once by the words, "And God said, Let there be light, and there was light!" Under the influence of this heaven-born agent, light, the earth was soon clothed with glory and beauty. Light is first a revealer, disclosing the state of things as they actually exist; and, second, it is (under the great Creator) actually itself *a creator*, calling into existence things which *do not* and *can not* exist without its agency. Remove the sun from our system, and how long would either animal or vegetable life remain upon our globe! But the *light* of the sun may be enjoyed without its *heat;* as when its rays fall obliquely upon the earth, and are not received into its bosom; or when we receive its rays *reflected*, as from the moon. But how potent are his rays *directly* received into the *bosom* of the earth!! How converting—how transforming is their power!! The gloom of night is converted into the effulgence of day! The desolations of winter are converted into the life and beauties of spring! But *light* is *knowledge*, and *darkness* is *ignorance*, in all matters. Enwrapt in the darkness of night, we know not whither we go. "How dreary the empire of night!" and not only *dreary*, but *dreadful!* "Thou makest darkness, and it is night, wherein all the

beasts of the forest do creep forth." This is the time for slaughter and destruction! But at *best* a painful *suspense* is attendant upon a state of darkness. We may be harrassed with a thousand fears when no danger is nigh; or we may repose in conscious security in the very jaws of danger and death. The way-worn traveller in the wilderness, having lost his way in the darkness of night, may lie down to rest in the very lair of the sleeping lion! or, his fears may drive sleep from him when no danger is near! But in the one case how would the helpless man tremble and quake when the morning light should reveal to him his real condition! So in the other, how great would be his joy when the light of day should reveal to him that no danger was near. "Whatsoever makes *manifest* is *light*," said an ancient writer. Indeed, what could we know of all that is above us, below us, or around us, but for its manifestations? What could we know of beauty, of symmetry, of size, of shape, of dimensions, or of any of the real properties of things around us, but for the revealings of light? But, as has been said, light not only *reveals*, but also *creates*. All the beauties of color, all the rich variety of hues, and the endlessly variegated shades, both in the *animal* and *vegetable* kingdoms, owe their existence to the emanations of the "king of day."

But you may be ready to inquire, Why this descant upon the attributes of light? I answer, My object is the same as that of the author of the Psalm quoted in the beginning of the letter. It is to illustrate the tendency and power of that volume which we call "*sacred*." The object of the scripture quoted is to show that a *perfect analogy* exists between the *light* of the sun in the natural world, and the light of revelation in the moral world—the world of mind. Take away the *Bible*, and the moral world is as desolate and drear as would be the natural world without the sun. In the darkness that would ensue all distinction between *virtue* and *vice* would be lost. Take any of the heathen nations, either ancient or modern, and you will see them deifying the most enormous *vices*, and contemning some of the most refined moral virtues. The courage and blood-thirsty cruelty of the warrior were, with them, worthy of adoration; while *meekness* and *forbearance* towards an enemy showed a *meanness* of spirit worthy of all execration. Cicero could discourse eloquently upon piety to the gods; but when a beloved daughter was taken from him by death, he is said to have exclaimed, "I *hate* the gods."

Upon the whole, then, we exclaim with the Psalmist, "Who can understand his errors" without the light of this law? As the sun arises and chases away the darkness and gloom of night, so did the Sun of Righteousness arise upon the nations: "The people that sat in dark-

ness saw a great light; and to them who sat in the region and shadow of death light has sprung up."

In the common translation of the Psalm quoted, the force of the illustration evidently intended by the author, is lost. When Israel's King describes the effulgence of the natural sun, as he rises with giant strength, and shakes his golden locks, "rejoicing as a strong man to run a race"—shedding his vivifying rays on all the objects in his course; he certainly means to say, '*So* is the law of the Lord in its influences upon the soul—*so* are the testimonies of the Lord to make wise the simple—*so* are the statutes of the Lord to rejoice the heart—and the commandment of the Lord to enlighten the eyes.' But we have said that the *light* of the sun may be enjoyed without its *heat*, as when its rays are reflected by the moon. Here let me say, my friend, that unbelievers every where in Christian lands enjoy the *reflex light* of revelation. They walk by *moonlight!* Their mothers, or sisters, or friends are Christians, and reflect its light upon them. But we might be bound in perpetual frost and everlasting chains of ice, notwithstanding the rays of the moon. Again, the rays of the sun may fall *directly* upon an object, yet if they fall obliquely they will glance off and be as powerless as were *reflected* rays..

Thus it is with multitudes of professing Christians: although they receive the direct rays of the Sun of Righteousness, yet because they do not present their bosoms to receive his rays into their hearts, they are like our earth during its *winter solstice*. O! that I could here persuade you, my dear friend, to leave the cold and gloomy vale of *unbelief!* Our glorious leader *invites* you to examine his pretensions. He says, "If any man is disposed to do his will, he shall know of the doctrine whether it be of God, or whether I speak of myself." He thus puts it within the power of every man to decide upon his doctrine with unerring certainty. He promises light and life to all who will follow him. He says, "I am the light of the world: he that follows me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life." I entreat you to put these things to the test. Turn you about, and present your bosom to receive the direct rays of the Sun of Righteousness: so will he chase away the darkness of night from your soul—he will dispel its gloom—he will burst the *icy fetters* of winter from around thy heart, and shed upon it the genial influences of spring—he will refresh the soul with balmy zephyrs, and make "the desert" of thy soul to "rejoice and blossom as the rose." He will impart to thy soul the blossoms and fragrance of spring—the beauty and glory of summer—and the rich, the golden fruits of autumn. Receive the "good seed of the kingdom;" and under the influence of the dews and sunshine of Heaven, the fruit will be "life everlasting."

Affectionately yours, M. S. C.

CHURCH EDIFICATION.

The grand intention of the Christian institution,—viz. the reformation of the world—the highest possible amelioration of the condition of man in this life—is to be effected by the church; "that now, to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places might be made known by the *church* the manifold wisdom of God" Eph. iii. 10. Wherefore, it necessarily follows, that church edification—the grand proximate object of its constitution—being divinely intended, and abundantly provided for, ought to be the primary intention of all concerned: that is, of all the members, but especially of those divinely appointed for that purpose. For—"He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints—for the work of the ministry—for the edifying the body of Christ; till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, *to a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.*" Eph. iv. 12, 13.

When we consider the high attainments above specified, as divinely intended for the whole body; surely we must feel deeply convinced of the indispensable necessity of the most abundant, most diligent, and persevering use of all the means, with which we are divinely furnished for those high and blissful purposes: especially when we advert to the diversified condition of the members; both with respect to their natural capacities, dispositions, situations, and peculiar temptations,—and to that deadly depressing weight of inbred carnality, lying so heavily upon all.

It is, therefore, the intention of this essay to submit to the consideration of all, both teachers and taught, who are concerned for the perfection and happiness of the body of Christ upon earth,—the due and suitable use of the means, divinely intended for this most desirable purpose. Now these are distinctly and comprehensively two—viz. teachers, and teaching. The qualifications and duties both of the teachers, and of the taught,—what and how the former are to teach,—and how the latter are to behave under their tuition, are all divinely prescribed and determined in the holy scriptures; so that we have nothing to do but to proceed accordingly. Wherefore, in our farther investigation of this important subject, we shall proceed as follows—viz.—

I. Consider the qualifications both of the teachers and of the taught.

II. Their respective duties to each other.

III. The proper manner of proceeding, for the public edification of the congregation, on the Lord's day.

1st. We are, then, first to consider the qualifications both of teachers and taught. As to the latter, all that we deem necessary to state at present is, that they have made an intelligent scriptural confession of Christ in baptism, as did the primitive converts to Christianity, and are still continuing to walk in his law. As to the former, we would only observe at present, that they be such characters as are described in the following scriptures: 1 Tim. iii. 1—7. Titus i. 6—9. And that they be duly chosen and ordained; see Acts vi. 3, 8. and xiii. 2, 3. and xiv. 23; with 1 Tim. iv. 14. and v. 22. In the above quotations we

have a view both of the personal and official qualifications of the legitimate teachers of Christianity in the churches: the former of which could not qualify them for assuming that office, without the latter: for in no voluntary association does mere fitness give authority, without the consent of the society duly expressed.

2d. We come next to consider the respective duties of each. And here we would observe, in the first place, that it is the duty of the teachers to teach and rule well according to the scriptures:—to teach the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, divinely furnished for the edification of the church: that is,—all holy scripture—neither more nor less. For "all holy scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished for all good works." 2 Tim. iii. 16, 17. Yet all this must be done prudently, and skilfully, "rightly dividing the word of truth:" 2 Tim. ii. 15.—"giving to each his portion of meat in due season:" Matth. xxiv. 45. There is milk for babes, and meat for strong men. 1 Cor. iii. Heb. v. 12, 13. And as for those that are thus divinely taught—their duties to their teachers are most expressly declared in the following scriptures:—Gal. vi. 6. "Let him that is taught in the word communicate to him that teacheth, in all good things"—and 1 Tim. v. 17. "Let the elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honor, especially they that labor in word and *doctrine*;" that is —*teaching*—"For the scripture saith: Thou shalt not muzzle the ox, that treadeth out the corn; and the laborer is worthy of his reward." See also Heb. xiii. 6, 8, 17. "Remember them that have the rule over you, who have spoken to you the word of God; whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation: Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever.—Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves: for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account: that they may do it with joy, and not with grief; for that is unprofitable for you." Yea, surely it is in vain to employ teachers, if we will not submit to be taught by them!

But again, Christian teachers are not only bound to teach the Bible, the whole Bible, and that exclusively, in its true, literal, practical import; and to accommodate their teaching to the capacity and condition of their hearers, both publicly and privately, keeping back nothing that is profitable: see Acts xx. 20. But they should also be zealously active, faithful, and diligent,—"in season, and out of season, reproving, rebuking, and exhorting, with all long suffering and teaching; and that with all authority:" see 2 Tim. iv. 3.. with Titus iii. 15. Especially should they study to do every thing to the best advantage for the public edification of the church on the Lord's day. For this important purpose, a seasonable and sufficient portion of the day ought to be punctually devoted to public edification. Next—all the different exercises duly and suitably adjusted and provided for, so that every thing might be done decently and in order—every thing in the best manner to edification. For this purpose the portion, or portions of scripture, intended for the public edification, might be duly known to the church, having been previously appointed at the close of the former meeting, so that all the members might be duly prepared for their investigation.

Things thus duly and statedly arranged, the natural order of the public exercises follows of course. The day divinely appointed for church edification,—inscribed to the Lord—the herald and memorial of his resurrection, suggests to us immediately the celebration of that most blissful and glorious event—the seal and pledge of our justification; without which, not only the birth, but also the death of the Saviour, had been to us in vain; "for if Christ be not risen we are yet in our sins;" but, blessed be God "he was," not only "delivered for our offences; but "was also raised again for our justification:" Rom. iv. 25. 1 Cor. xv. 17. So that in celebrating *his resurrection*, we celebrate *our own justification*. Blessed be God, this is our first spiritual meal upon the first day of the week—the first dish upon the spiritual table of our weekly festival Surely it might well entertain us for one hour, in singing, and praying, and reading, and praising—about it. Next in order comes our weekly lesson in the holy scriptures, that we may add to our faith—knowledge; and thus be made wise to salvation, thoroughly furnished to all good works. Now there are but two ways in which the scriptures can be made forthcoming for our instruction in righteousness. The first is—the careful studious perusal of any portion of them, with a strict regard to the contextual connexion, and to the scriptural use and meaning of certain peculiar words and phrases where they occur, always adverting to the six following items; namely, —Who speaks,—to whom he speaks.—what he says,—why he says it,—when and where he said so. And then—to the subject matter of the portion under consideration; whether it be history, prophecy, commands, prohibitions, declarations, invitations, or promises: thus directing and fixing the attention of the hearers—the students, (as all genuine disciples are,) to the contents and import of the lesson under consideration. And lastly, by a catechetical investigation of the contents, to impress them distinctly and forcibly upon the minds of all concerned, that so they may be clearly perceived and retained; and so conclude with a brief, pertinent, practical exhortation. By—"a catechetical investigation"—is meant the manner of presenting the contents of the lesson to the consideration of the congregation, by proposing and answering such questions as will recall and exhaust the subject matter of the portion read, according to the preceding analysis; viz — What historic facts, what phophecies, what commands, what prohibitions, &c. &c. are contained in it—and all these distinctly stated by the teacher, with pertinent remarks and exhortations; the congregation, in the mean time, closely attending with open books. The congregation, however, may be divided into distinct classes, and examined privately. For the Apostle taught both publicly and privately: see Acts xx. 20.

So much for the first and general use and study of the holy scriptures: the second is for particular and special purposes;—namely, to obtain the amount of the divine testimony upon a particular subject; by collecting together, into one complete aggregate, all the places where it is mentioned. By thus searching the scriptures, and extracting their contents upon the subject of inquiry, we shall have it before us in all its attitudes, bearings, and relations.—"Every one, acquainted with the sacred scriptures, knows that the complete account, which they contain of any one article of religion, is never to be met with altogether in one place, without other subjects intermixed with it; but

is to be collected from many different passages, where the sacred writers have touched upon it. All these places, taken together, do make up the complete scripture account of the subject; they contain all the light which the spirit of revelation has thrown upon it, as needful for instruction. Whoever, then, will view any scripture truth, in all the light thus afforded, must search the scriptures for the different places in which it is contained, or where the subject is mentioned. In these places it will be found sufficiently explained,—enforced by all its proper motives,—applied to all its proper uses, and set in every advantageous light, needful for being rightly understood, and properly applied."*

These things being so, it evidently follows, that both those ways of studying the scriptures ought to be attended to: the former, for acquiring the knowledge of the Bible, as a whole; the latter, for understanding particularly, the full amount of what it teaches upon any one point —or topic. And each of these exercises, being suitably introduced by previous notification, may equally become subjects of public social investigation, as all subjects, introduced into the regular stated meetings of a congregation, ought to be; for, surely, *they*, that *study by proxy*, will never become learned.

3d. These exercises of celebrating the resurrection, and of attending to the stated lessons of the day, having been duly observed, and the congregation indulged with a short interval, the church, of course, next proceeds to commemorate the death and dying love of its Divine Redeemer. It is now afternoon, say 1 o'clock—he is yet upon the cross—as to the time of day—drawing near to the close of his sufferings; and the symbols of his death, instituted after the paschal supper, just before his sufferings, lie upon the table,—commonly called the Lord's table—the Lord's supper. This is the closing meal of our weekly festival. How rich in blessings! how costly! how refreshing!—"Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another." Rom. v. 8. 1 John iv. 10, 11. Hear him say, O! communicant, when you receive into your hand the bread—the symbol of his broken body—hear him say—"This is my body—broken for you"! And, likewise, also with the cup of blessing—"This is my blood shed for you—shed for the remission of the sins of many." And can you forbear, O! believing communicant, to say—with the master of the feast in Cana of Galilee,—"You have kept the best wine until now"!!! Yea, surely, this expression of his love is infinitely better than wine. "All the things that can be desired, are not to be compared with it."

The exhortations and praise elicited by this, closes the religious solemnities of the Lord's day—that blissful day, which he has given us to feast upon the provisions of his love. We breakfast together upon his resurrection; we dine upon the doctrine of his holy word; and sup upon his person—sacrificed for us. Thus are we richly and abundantly entertained and provided for, at the expense of the divine goodness. What a pity that we should not avail ourselves of it, by making an abundant and proper use of the rich provisions of his love!

* Gaston's Collections. Philadelphia, A. D. 1807.

And seeing all enjoyment lies in employment, surely four or five hours per week, spent together for this blissful purpose, should seem but a short space; and so it must and will, if we be not carnally-minded; and even if we be, it can only be cured by persevering in spiritual exercises. Let all, then, who would enjoy the salvation of God, avail themselves of the means of enjoyment, by making a diligent and proper use of them,—committing themselves to the divine mercy, humbly relying upon the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ; and, in so doing, they may rest assured upon the divine promise,—that their labor shall not be in vain in the Lord. 1 Cor. xv. 58.

THOMAS CAMPBELL.

NEW INSTITUTION—*No. I.*

PLAN OF A LITERARY, MORAL, AND RELIGIOUS SCHOOL; OR THE UNION OF FOUR INSTITUTIONS IN ONE—THE COMBINATION OF THE FAMILY, THE PRIMARY SCHOOL, THE COLLEGE, AND THE CHURCH IN ONE GREAT SYSTEM OF EDUCATION.

THE prospectus of this scheme appeared in the October number of last volume; since which time I have, from all parts of the land, heard but one opinion of "the magnificence of the scheme," (as one of our most learned Presidents of a State College is pleased to call it,) its importance, utility, and practicability. I am, therefore, so far as the judgment of our wisest and best men is concerned, emboldened to go somewhat into the details of the scheme.

I. *Its Location.*

If proper encouragement be given, it is proposed to locate it in the environs of Bethany, which is, as is generally known, the country residence of an individual. Bethany is 16 miles from Wheeling; 8 from Wellsburg, the county seat of Brooke, on the bank of the Ohio river; and about 38 from Pittsburg. There is no exaggeration in saying that a healthier soil or a purer air is not within the United States, than is around this location. During my residence of 29 years no epidemic has ever prevailed in this vicinity; not a single case of cholera ever originated in the county of Brooke; no autumnal fevers; no agues, nor endemics of that class, have ever, in the memory of man, been witnessed here. I have it from those who lived here in Indian times, that, from the first settlement of the country till now, no epidemic was ever known on the limpid and rapid Buffalo, from its source to the Ohio river, except the infantile diseases of the small pox, measles, and whooping-cough, which regard neither soil nor climate.

Our rich calcareous hills, sometimes precipitous, acuminated, and acclivous; occasionally also, orbicular, oval, and pyramidal; at one

time gently sloping by gradual undulations, or rising into bold and craggy prominences, clothed with lofty forest timber of great variety and stateliness, give to our country not only the most delightful scenery, but afford us the most genial currents of the purest air, and streams and fountains of the most pellucid and delicious water. The soil, too, as prone to verdure and the finest pasture, as it is favorable to all the grains and fruits that strengthen and solace man, always promises milk and honey, as well as bread and meat, to all that cultivate it. And if in winter a surly blast from the Boreal regions of cold Canada and the American Lakes should make the leafless forests quail, our hills, in benevolent anticipation of the fierce invader, have richly stored themselves with mineral coal, as was the wooden horse with the Greeks, that when carried into our houses give us the cheerful hearth, and scatters cold and darkness away.

Though our population is no better than it ought to be, I believe there is not a more moral county in America than the county of Brooke. Our county seat, I am told, has been for a whole year without a scene of native intemperance; and often our grand jury has met and dispersed without a single presentment. But two or three vagrants in 25 years have been sent to the Penitentiary; and no one has been capitally punished, so far as I have heard, since the county was established.

Again, as respects the unfortunate controversy between slavery and anti-slavery, we are, perhaps, on the most neutral ground, as a county, that could well be imagined. We are in a slave state, it is true; but almost literally without slaves. The few colored people that are amongst us are tolerated merely because of their good character and pacific deportment; and therefore we have nothing to fear, nor to be feared, on that account, in any issue that human sagacity can anticipate.

In all these points of view, which indeed are the all-essential points in the location of a great literary and moral institution, we could not imagine a more favorable site than that contemplated. It has been to me, indeed, often a source of wonder why a country so inviting to persons of taste, and so favorable to all the objects of life, as this is, at the congress of the great arteries of this immense Union—whither national roads, canals, rail-ways, rivers, and mineral wealth, have tended, or are tending, should have been so much and so long overlooked as it has been. I have supposed that its proximity to the river, and the fact that the land of promise is always in some yet unknown region in the "far West," may be the cause of this singular neglect. But the refluent wave is swelling, and the time is not far distant when it shall bear upon its bosom, from less propitious climes, and soils, and localities, a population of more science, taste, and mental re-

sources, than as yet have made these hills and vallies re-echo the praise of the Lord. Certainly, for a literary and moral institution like that contemplated, its localities are just what they ought to be.

Touching the Family Institution, it is intended for the double purpose of finding accommodations for those in attendance at the primary school, and for the developement of the domestic character, as well as for furnishing a model of family government and econony. It is to be under the constitutional and parental government of two persons, call the *Patron* and *Matron*. It is intended for a *home* for lads from any age up to 14; not only for those whose parents are living, but for those who have lost one parent or both. How many thousand such there are in this community who must be educated from home, and even at the expense of rending not only the common ties of relationship, but even those of brotherhood itself! To such surviving parents or guardians we could not imagine a greater earthly desideratum than to have some home—some asylum where their children and wards might be sent, and in which their physical, intellectual, and moral health, education and comfort, would be made as certain and secure as earthly guarantee could make them. This is one feature, as it is one object of the Family Institution, to my mind of transcendant importance, and which we imagine would not sufficiently impress the attention of many readers from the rude draft furnished in the October Harbinger. It is only in reference to this feature of the family institution and to the paternal feeling that we would think of a female family institution in the vicinity, for the sisters or relatives of those lads who might be in the primary school departments; of the expediency of which, I am not dogmatically certain. But as it is only a circumstance, and not an element of our scheme, it is open to consideration.

The Rules for the government of this family will, of course, be printed, published, and placed in every room of the edifice. These Rules will respect domestic arrangements and behaviour, times of rising, eating and retiring to rest—times of family instruction and worship—modes of attendance upon these duties—hours of amusement, recreation, &c. At present I shall only advert to the religious part of the family system. I do this because of some questions propounded me on the propriety and expediency of the religious training of children. But I shall attend to this in a separate article.

INFANT TRAINING.

I shall here introduce an extract from the letter of an intelligent and amiable sister, of M——— county, Va., under date of the 3d ultimo, propounding the question in the following deeply interesting manner:—

"I feel daily, my dear brother, more and more my responsibility for all the duties that devolve on me. I would ask, if it be not too great a tax on your more important avocations, a few hints for my assistance. As a mother, I of course feel the deepest solicitude for my child. I have an only son. I would wish to bring him up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. I gave him to God when he was born; and, like Timothy, I wish him to know the scriptures from his birth. I have been at a loss on some matters with regard to teaching religion to children, and hardly know whether it is proper to teach them to *pray*, or not. It seems to me almost natural that the first aspirations of an infant heart should be to God. When I teach my child that God is the author of every blessing, how natural is gratitude—thankfulness is almost involuntary. On the other hand, before he can understand the sacrifice and mediation of Christ, should I teach him to pray in his name? I have conversed with many of our brethren on the subject, and they generally seem to think sinners, unbelievers, ought to be taught that they have no right to pray; and children, even well instructed, come under that head. Please let me know your own course in this particular. You cannot know how much gratification your 'last plan' of a school and college afforded me."

In a family institution religion should be inculcated by doctrine, precept, and example. It is the most essential part of education. Our political and religious theories have been most mischievous on this point.

Politicians say, that every one should have the right of choosing a religion for himself, and that, too, when of mature age and reason; and therefore it is ungenerous to anticipate the development of mind and to impose our faith upon our children in their infancy and child hood. This is more specious than solid. If it were as possible, as it impossible to be perfectly neutral, disinterested, and impartial on this subject, several questions, which must obtrude themselves upon the reflecting, expose the consummate fallacy of such policy. What proportion of the human family arrive at maturity? How many have the power—how many have the disposition to examine? Scarce a third of all that are born arrive at maturity: of that third not one in ten has *the means* of comparing all religions. They cannot obtain the creeds and religions of all countries and all ages. If they had the means, not one in ten has the education and mind to examine all the pretensions of all parties, to select the best. And of those who have both the means and the power, not one in ten at that age has the disposition. So that in fact not more than about one in three thousand of those constituting Christendom would ever decide the matter at all on the assumption of the mere speculative politician.

In the next place, youth needs the restraints of religion much more than age; and to raise up a son or a daughter to manhood or woman-

hood without religious instruction, is to imperil all—conscience, character, salvation!

Again, youth is the seed-time, the time for planting the principles that are to influence and give character to future life: why, then, should the most commanding and powerful of these be left out, until the actual business of life leaves neither room nor taste for it?

But as intimated, it is impossible to be neutral. Something must be taught—religion or irreligion—morality or immorality—belief or unbelief—worship or no worship. If we were to be perfectly taciturn upon the subject, our practice would preach and teach for us.

The man of religious feeling exclaims, 'Of these alternatives we cannot hesitate which to choose.' We must teach something. What shall it be?—Sectarism? By no means. We have a Bible. Its history, events, precepts, promises, predictions can be taught without any scholastic theory, any more than if none such had ever existed. This is susceptible of ample demonstration; but this is not the point now. It is decided, Religion is to be taught. The question now is, *When?*

When arrived at 21? The soil is then sown. Generally at that period the whole ground is pre-occupied—the heart is full of other matters. Why, then, give the world, the flesh, and the devil twenty-one years a start of us! This will not bear a moment's argument. We must begin with the first indications of thought. We must plant the fear of God—his greatness, goodness, holiness—his omnipresence, justice, truth, and faithfulness, as well as his mercy and compassion in the untrodden soil of the infant heart, as soon as we can reach it by word or deed—by precept or example. We must believe and practise what Solomon has taught—"The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom"—"To depart from evil is understanding"—and "Train up a child in the way he *should go*"!!

But our theories begin to impinge us here. Shall we teach our infants to pray? Shall we command or forbid them? Neither, perhaps, is fitting or consistent. We should neither make hypocrites nor formalists of them; but we should deeply imbue their minds with the majesty, glory, and excellency of God, and teach them how he may be worshipped, praised, invoked; and in their presence, and with themselves, alone, pray to God for them; and most familiarly present them by *name* before the Lord. But if, as will sometimes happen, their feelings should prompt them to pray, what then? Repress them not. If thy son desire to thank God, or to ask a favor in the name of his Son, forbid him not; nay, rather encourage him. Remember it is written, "Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected

praise!" The sweetest hosannas that ever echoed in the streets of Jerusalem were lisped from the lips of children, and accepted by the Lord in person! How sweetly did their little tongues warble "Hosannah to the Son of David! Blessed be he that cometh in the name of the Lord!"

But some theorist will say, 'You take the work of conversion into your own hands, and think to educate your children in religion as in science.' It is enough to say to such neglectors of their duty, 'Parents, bring up your children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.' And if any one can bring them up in the correction and instruction of the Lord without deeply imbuing their minds with these views and sentiments, he must have some other book to guide him than the Book which contains our religion. The Lord has not commanded impossibilities. We may do this thing; we may cause our children to know the holy scriptures from their earliest years; and thus the unfeigned faith of the parents may, by the prayers and the favor of God, be transmitted to their children's children.

Much depends upon the manner of this infant teaching, as well as upon the matter. No fables, speculations, theories, nor probabilities ought to be named to them. Facts, events, precepts, promises, threatenings ought to be stated with earnestness, confidence, and authority, as though there was no doubt of them. Very much depends on this. Dr. Paley has made full as many sceptics, perhaps, as Christians, by his use of the words *probable*, moral certainty, and an unbecoming diffidence and modesty. This is not the spirit, manner, or custom of certainty, of assurance, of confidence in any great matter. Teach your son nothing in religion or morality, of which you have not the fullest assurance; and then teach it as one that has the authority of truth. I know of nothing more essential to successfully communicating the first principles of religion, than this manner.

Upon the whole, this good and great work is scandalously neglected and misunderstood; and the consequence is, no nation ever hastened to destruction with more rapid strides than ours. It is, with me, as evident as truth of holy writ, that when parents neglect their duty, or when family discipline is neglected, there is nothing in any other institution on earth fully to compensate it. The training of children rationally and religiously in the fear of the Lord, so far as my personal knowledge and information extend, is more neglected in the United States than in any Protestant community on earth. We Christians must reform—greatly reform. We must bring our infants—our little children to the Lord, remembering that he said, "Suffer *little* children to come to me." He will still bless them. Let us dedicate them to

the Lord, and bring them up for him. He has long since asked the first born—the first fruits of every thing; but he now under Christ asks for all our children. But I must leave something for another number. A. C.

PARTYISM.

There is no evil of the present day more to be deprecated, and to be avoided, than that of partyism in the Christian kingdom; and to such an extent has it obtained in these latter days, that Christianity, in matter and form, has almost been exiled from the world; and although millions are to be found who are called *Christians*, as distinct from *Jews* and *Pagans*, yet scarcely a vestige of original Christianity can now be found exhibited on earth. The diligent student of the word of God in vain attempts to find in the New Testament the sectarian parties which now constitute *all* (I was about to say) of the church of Christ on earth. He sees among us separate and distinct organizations, voluntary associations, party names, different creeds, arrayed in hostile attitude against each other; and while in the spirit of pride and self-sufficiency each believes that his own party is in the truth, he denounces all the others as being in error. Thus mutually hating and being hated is the order of the day, and the necessary result of the present divided state of Christianity in the world.

In the New Testament we see a most attractive object presented before us in the church of Christ united and compacted in every part, like a well-formed, full-grown, healthy human body. The spirit of union and of brotherly kindness are among the most striking features; and nothing awakens so much concern and meets with so prompt a reprobation as the idea of schism or division in this divine institution. In all the Epistles this subject is adverted to, and exhortations of the most solemn and impressive kind are laid before the brethren. It must be obvious that the occasions for divisions in the primitive church were greater and of a more serious character than those which exist in the present day. We venture to affirm that no sectarian institution now on earth could give the one-tithe part the reason for separation from the body of Christ, as could the Jewish converts in the original churches, for separation from the Gentile Christians, or the reverse; and yet with what jealousy did the Apostles guard this point, and how sedulously did they labor to preserve the unity of the spirit by the bond of peace. In the apostolic age no separation was made on this account; and, indeed, none obtained until the times of Adrian, when the Nazarenes seceded from the Christians, very much to their own prejudice, and against the exhortations of their brethren, who greatly disapproved of their conduct in this affair. For many ages the Jewish Christians entertained a warm attachment for the obsolete institutions of Moses. They circumcised, observed the Sabbath, and yet no schism was occasioned by it, and no one thought seriously of dividing the church or of denouncing their brethren on these accounts; but now the spirit of intolerance is so high, and the zeal for partyism so rife, that nothing of the kind could be borne: revolt and division would

instantly obtain under such a state of things. Indeed I have been credibly informed that in a city of the West a congregation was divided in twain upon the ground of introducing the practice of giving out two lines of the Psalm instead of the one, which the clerk in the solemn, which is the nasal tone of the conventicle, was wont to do. And if the history of divided Christendom was now faithfully written, it would be found that in most cases the different sects were made pretty much in the same way. We have seen sufficient in our day among those who have professed the ancient faith, to convince us that the bond of union may easily be broken by those who attach undue importance to matters of opinion or of expediency, or things even lawful; for be it remembered that a thing may be lawful, and yet not expedient; and the most unmanageable and restless spirits that we have met with, are those who denounce as temporizers their brethren who exercise moderation in relation to those subjects which, although lawful, are not absolutely necessary to the existence of Christianity, and which, if imposed upon the brethren, would, without adding any thing to the influence of religion, tend to disturb the peace and comfort of the disciples. It was certainly lawful for the Gentile Christians to protest against the Jewish converts for their adherence to the antiquated ordinances of the Jewish law, and doubtless this was done by a few hot-headed flaming bigots; but the apostolic rule in relation to all such cases, was, "Him that is weak in the faith receive without regard to differences of opinion. Destroy not with thy meat him for whom Christ died. Now walkest thou not charitably." Sectarianism is one of the works of the flesh. Compare 1 Cor. iii. 3, 4.; Gal. v. 20; Rom. xiv. 17.; 1 Cor. xii. 12.; Eph. iv. 3. The Apostle commands us to mark them who cause divisions, contrary to the teaching which he gave, and to avoid them; and has also named in the same line, and strung on the same thread, sects and factions, with uncleanness, sorcery, brawlings, intoxications, revilings, murders, &c.; for they are all of the same family—they are of their father the devil, and the doom of perdition awaits them. We are, then, warned by these considerations against any thing which would have a tendency to separate the body of Christ. We should occasion ourselves to look at such a result as one of the greatest calamities which could befall us, and as under the highest obligations to preserve the unity of the church after the example and upon the same principles as exerted in the apostolic age. On one occasion the British monarch desired to make Arnold known to the high-minded Earl of Balcarras: after the usual ceremony of introduction Arnold extended his hand to the Earl. "What, sir," said the latter to the King, at the same time drawing himself up to his proudest height, "Is this the *traitor* Arnold?" and refused to reciprocate the *honor*. "The hand of Douglas was his own."

In the same manner would an Apostle have treated even a co-laborer if he had proved recreant to the cause, and have attempted to betray the interest of the Christian kingdom at the shrine of a party, or into the hands of the enemy. All the divisions that can obtain among us will have their origin in difference of opinion in relation to doctrine, form of government, discipline, or order of worship, or in matters of expediency. Let us, then, habituate ourselves to think and to speak in favor of union, as the only ground upon which truth can triumph over

error, light can dissipate the darkness, and the church can save the world. Let this be our motto; and whatever we give up, let us not part with "*the unity of the spirit.*" We may differ about things lawful and expedient, whether repentance precedes faith, or faith repentance; about standing or kneeling in prayer; about what we shall call our public speakers, preachers, teachers, or evangelists; or whether we shall have any such persons or not, or need them; or about how we shall raise funds in the congregation, or how much may be needed; or about the imposition of hands, if now necessary, and for whom; or about singing, whether grave or gay, the old tunes of our fathers', or those of modern date, whether by note or by memory. We may differ about *the name* Christian and Disciple, as the great patronymic of the citizens of the kingdom of God. We may express ourselves with freedom upon all of these subjects, and may honestly differ; but "let all our works be done in love;" and no evil, but good will be the result.

JAMES CHALLEN.

EMBRYO HERESY.

In the ancient city of Palmyra, as tradition says, there was a large church with but two bishops. They believed in a simple plurality. The senior bishop in some of his proceedings disaffected a few members of the congregation by his great vigilance over their moral behaviour. They complained not to himself, as the Christian law required; but they rehearsed their grivances to the junior bishop. Till that day, no two bishops had cultivated a more perfect amity, or displayed a more cordial unity of aim, interest, and feeling. But in human nature there are I and you; and a class of feelings, sympathies, and desires which rally around these two pronouns; and though often apparently dormant, these special pleaders are easily waked; and when awaked, are the most sleepless and observant *lynxes* in nature.

The frequent appeals to the junior bishop to interpose for them and defend them, originated between himself and his co-pastor ungracious suspicions that he was becoming the organ and tool of a party, rather than displaying the character of a bishop of the church. A lack of prudence, indeed, seemed to be all that was wanting on the part of the junior in the first instance; but in a short time, imperceptibly even to himself, he became the special pleader of the disaffected, and opposer of his senior and more experienced brother; till at length, in open day, and before the church and the world, they appeared opposing one another. The congregation finally split into two halves. The senior bishop had his church, and the junior had his church. Then all the churches in the district of Palmyra, to the number of more than half a hundred, became involved in the affair—some siding with the senior

and some with the junior bishop and their parties; till finally two distinct associations were formed—two rival altars and institutions erected, which continued to the great injury of the gospel in those regions for more than one hundred and seventy years. Meanwhile, other partisan views, opinions, and proceedings nurtured and strengthened the ancient enmity, and the original cause was soon forgotten, being concealed behind more plausible offences from the eye of both parties.

Who, that now surveys with impartial eyes the ruins of the churches of the Palmy City, cannot trace them all to the indiscretion of the first complainant in going to the wrong person, and of that person in not directing him to make his complaints to him against whom they were concerned, and whose duty it was either to justify himself or abandon his measures.

How many discords, strifes, enmities, and divisions have grown up in the same way! Let us then, brethren, guard against embryo heresy, and destroy the hydra in the egg. A. C.

HERETICAL PERIODICALS.

There has been, with perhaps a single exception, an almost perfect harmony, not only in the efforts of all the brethren who plead the cause of reformation, but in the numerous periodicals that have from time to time risen up to assist us in this grandest and noblest of enterprizes. But we have seen at sundry times indications of that indiscretion which eventuated in the desolations of the Palmyra churches above referred to. Brethren have not uniformly taken their complaints to the proper person—to him against whom they are preferred. I have seen brethren carry some umbrage, or demur, or grievance, preferred against myself, to other periodicals; and, without intending it, no doubt, have given an appearance of editorial rivalries, till now some of the sects are representing us in editorial discord. My rule has been, not to notice any thing of that sort: once only have I been compelled to allude to it in self-defence. But, as a time of peace and amity is the time to prepare for storms and difficulties, I take the present opportunity of very plainly and emphatically staking out my course on all such occasions. My pages are always open to friend or foe, brother or alien, who has any thing to offer worthy of being heard; and the ability to offer it in an intelligible and respectful manner. I will not, then, notice any thing avowed, stated, or even hinted against my views, sayings, doings, measures, &c. by any brother who has not the

manliness, candor, and good feeling to offer it to myself. When I refuse him a hearing he is at liberty to go where he pleases, and I am at liberty to speak of him as I may think he deserves. But until I refuse him, I will regard him as a disorderly brother, in this one point at least—as a *heresy-maker* in fact, if not in intention.

Some have justified a plurality of periodicals, if not on this ground, on such ground as might lead some to imagine that we wanted an *opposition line.* So things have appeared to me. I may have been wrong, and I trust that I have been mistaken in this conclusion. But, brethren, on my flag the old motto is still inscribed—"Call no man Master on earth; for you have but one Master, the Messiah"—and I will set my face like a flint not only against schism, but against the appearance and the causes of it. While I hold a pen on earth the brethren shall never need a second periodical to oppose me: they have mine: they shall have mine: therefore I will neither hear nor notice them in any other. A. C.

"LAY HANDS SUDDENLY ON NO MAN."

WHAT can it mean? One of three things only! And these that great author, Mr. *They Say*, affirms to be, "To heal a man, to seize a man, or to ordain a man to office." We shall try them all.

1st. *To heal a man.* Why, then, not do it *suddenly?* That he may suffer long, and almost perish before you relieve him! But suppose the sick man were almost dead: in such cases might we not do it suddenly? No, says Paul; on *no* man lay hands suddenly: rather let him die than risk it. Why? Unless he repent, should he recover he will sin again, and you will be a partaker with him in his sins: for, but for you, he would have sinned no more! Thus ends the first hypothesis.

2d. *To seize a man—suddenly seize no man.* Do not in quarrelling with a man, suddenly take hold of him; for, in that case, he might seriously injure you. Fight him at arm's length; but seize him not with your hands. Who will stand up for this!

'I do not mean that,' says the literalist: 'I mean in cases of discipline. Do not bring a man before the elders of the church, or do not go to law too hastily in either church or state. Take time and deliberate well. But to whom was the command given? To a President of a church! to an Evangelist! to a Bishop! Such officers are not the persons to introduce cases, but to hear and judge them; or, at least, to execute the law of Christ. But why not *suddenly?* The sooner an offender is brought to justice the better. No, no: let him have a long

time to do mischief before you subject him to the discipline of the church; for were you to seize him suddenly, you might incense him, and thus make him sin; and you would be an accomplice or an accessory. But, beside these singular incongruities, it must be shown that Moses, the Messiah, or Paul ever used the words "lay hands" on a man in reference to any sort of discipline whatever. It cannot be shown, unless in cases of civil punishment, that the phrase ever was so used; or in acts of violence. And if we suppose Paul forbade *violence*, we shall ask why only forbade he it to be done suddenly. You may do violence, but do it not *suddenly!*

We have, then, but one meaning remaining, viz.—Impose hands suddenly on no man; or, Invest no man with sacred office until he is first approved: for should you ordain to office an incompetent person, you must, to a certain extent, participate in his sins of mal-administration.

That this is the only true and proper meaning of the phrase, will appear on a careful consideration of the whole context, from the beginning of the 3d to the end of the 5th chapter:—

1. In chapter iii. Paul gives the qualifications of a Christian bishop, of a deacon, and of a deaconess, and concludes with a similar precept: "Let these [the deacons] also be first proved; then let them have or exercise the office." Two important words here are often overlooked—*also* and *first*. The deacons *also* implies that the bishops were to be *first* proved. To what is *first* contrasted? Certainly before investment with the office. *First, approve—second, ordain.*

After a considerable dip into the apostacy, and sundry hints, cautions, and instructions, he returns to his church officers. His method was:—

1st. He draws out their attributes or qualifications.

2d. He forbids their being suddenly accused, or hastily condemned.

3d. He provides for their maintenance.

4th. He directs how they are to be rebuked when they sin. And,

5th. While speaking of their sins, he forbids their being invested with the office suddenly; or, until *first* approved.

The context, as well as the phrase itself, shows unequivocally how ordination was performed by consent and direction of the Apostles. The command here to *lay on hands*, can, by no conceivable hypothesis, refer to any thing but the investiture with office. The whole context is in meaning this: Timothy, I will tell you whom to choose for bishops and deacons; let them be well proved, and well sustained in office, knowing that faithful men will be often censured, receive not an accusation against them but on competent testimony. When they sin, rebuke them before all, that others may fear; and as their sins are

greatly scandalous to the cause, take care whom you ordain. Lay hands suddenly on no man; neither be partakers of their sins; keep yourself pure from the blood and sins of all men.

If any one can imagine how the Apostle could have more clearly or forcibly expressed himself on the mode in which persons were, by divine authority, first invested with office, I will thank him to show a better way than that which the contextual developments in this epistle furnish. A. C.

FAMILY CULTURE.

CONVERSATIONS AT THE CARLTON HOUSE.

No. II.

After reading on Monday evening the first, second, and third chapters of Genesis, Olympas resumed his interrogations on the creation of man.

Olympas. Tell me, James, of what materials did God make man?

James. We are not told in the first chapter of what he was made It reads, "God created man in his own image;" but it does not say of what.

Olympas. But we have a second narrative of the creation of man in the second chapter. What do you learn from it, Susan?

Susan. "God *formed** man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life;" and thus he "became a living soul." Father, how did God "breathe into his nostrils"?

Olympas. He caused the air, which is the breath of *lives*—of all *animal lives*, to enter his lungs, and thus to put them in motion; and so man began to live: but he also inspired him with a *spirit*—as Elihu says, "There is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth him understanding;" and thus "he teacheth us more than the beasts of the earth, and maketh us wiser than the fowls of heaven." We are not, indeed, told of the manner of the communication of the spirit, because we could not understand it; for man cannot understand any thing about the nature of spirit. We only know that God has given us a spirit as well as a body.

Olympas. Can any of the senior class mention any passage of scripture that distinctly states the two-fold origin of man—as springing from Heaven and from Earth?

* The words *created* and *formed* are as different in the original Hebrew as they are in the Greek and English. God created man, he formed him out of the dust, and breathed into him the breath of life; and thus man became a living soul.

Thomas Dilworth. Solomon, when speaking of death, seems to refer to this double origin of man. His words are, "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return to God that gave it." Eccles. xii. 7.

Olympas. But does not the same Solomon elsewhere say that the beasts and their souls, and man and his soul, alike return to the earth? His words are, "All go unto one place; all are of dust, and all turn to dust again." And the *all* in this connexion relates to man and beast.

T. Dilworth. But he only there speaks of all that is visible: for concerning the invisible spirit of both, he immediately adds, "Who [discerneth or] knoweth the spirit of man that goeth upward," ascends to God; "and the spirit of the beast that goeth downward to the earth." Man's spirit, then, ascends to God, and the beast's spirit or animal soul goes with it to the dust.

Olympas. Reuben, can you name any portion of New Testament scripture that speaks of the compound nature of man?

Reuben. Paul somewhere speaks of the body, soul, and spirit of man; but I know not where.

Olympas, You allude to his praying that God would sanctify the Thessalonians—body, soul, and spirit, I presume. It is evident, then, that man has a spirit that on death goeth not downward as the spirit of the beast. But we must ask the junior class some more questions. Henry, when God made man, what did he give him?

Henry. Dominion.

Olympas. Dominion over what?

Henry. Over all cattle, fowl, and fish—over the earth and every thing upon it.

Olympas. And where did he put him?

Henry. In a garden he planted for him eastward in Eden.

Olympas. What kind of fruits and trees grew in this garden, Susan?

Susan. "Every tree that was pleasant to the sight and good for food."

Olympas. The senses were all consulted in this garden. The word *Eden* and the word *Paradise* both mean *delight, pleasure.* It was *eastward* in reference to the land of Canaan, or to the place where Moses wrote the law. But let me ask, What were the most celebrated trees in this garden?

James. The Tree of Life, and the Tree of Death.

Olympas. I have sometimes called one of these the Tree of Death in contrast with the other; but I inquire for the name which God gave it?

James. "The Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil."

Olympas. Where did these trees stand?

Henry. The Tree of Life grew in the midst of the garden; but I do not know where the Tree of Knowledge grew.

Olympas. It would seem as though it were not far from the Tree of Life. It is, however, of little consequence as to its position in the garden. What was Adam to do in this garden?

Susan. He was to dress it and keep it in order.

Olympas. But we have gone too fast. I must return and ask the second class some questions. Have we not, William, a sort of double narrative of the creation of all things.

William. We have a history of what God done, and a history of what the Lord God done.

Olympas. I do not understand you, William. Explain yourself.

William. The history of what God done ends with the 3d verse of the second chapter. And the history of what the Lord God done begins with the fourth verse of the 2d, and ends with man's expulsion from Eden and the 3d chapter of Genesis.

Olympas. Why do you make this difference between God and the Lord God?

William. On counting the first section, I find the word *God* by itself thirty-four times, and Lord God never: the spirit of God once. But in the second section, which ends with the 3d chapter, I find *Lord God* twenty times, and *God* not once

Olympas. Have you all made the same observation?

Mary. I find the word *God* by itself three times in the third chapter.

Edward. But Moses never uses it. The serpent uses it three times. He never says *Lord God*, but only God. William and I have made the count twice, and find it just as he says. The first account ascribes it all to God, whom Moses names thirty-four times, and his spirit once; while in the second he ascribes all to the Lord God, and names him twenty times.

Olympas. Have you extended your observations beyond the third chapter on this point.

Edward. The fourth chapter contains a different narrative; and Moses used the name of the *Lord* alone nine times. Thus the first section of the history ascribes every thing to God—the second every thing to the Lord God, while the third acknowledges only the Lord. Afterwards these titles appear to be used indiscriminately.*

* *Lord* and *God* are both Saxon words. The former denotes *good;* the latter denotes a *dispenser of bread. Elohim* is the original for *God*, and *Jehovah* for *Lord*, which, for the first time, is found in the fourth verse of the second chapter

Our English word *Lord*, while it uniformly represents the Hebrew *Jehovah*, does not give the particular meaning of it, but simply denotes the being who is Jehovah The reason of the difference in the style of those three sections seems to be that in the first

Olympas. Names always represent persons, actions, things, or relations. Different names applied to God represent the various relations in which he stands to himself, and to the universe of which he is the author. But, Eliza, will you tell us all you know about the origin of woman?

Eliza Woman's creation is found not in the first, but in the second section of the history; after Eden was planted and all things arranged for her comfort, the Lord God caused a deep or death-like sleep to fall on Adam. Meanwhile he extracted a rib from his side, healed up the wound, and out of that rib made a woman, a help meet, or companion for Adam. Adam, on recovering his senses, and on receiving this present from the Lord God, exclaimed, "Bone of my bone, flesh of my flesh; thou shalt be called Woman, and for thee henceforth shall a man forsake father and mother, sister and brother, and to thee shall he adhere as his own flesh."

Olympas. And what now was to be the future destiny of this happy pair?

Eliza. They were to live in that delightful garden and partake of all its pleasures—to eat of the Tree of Life, and be for ever young, beautiful, and happy, while they obeyed one single precept.

Olympas. What, Reuben, do you call that precept—a positive or a moral precept?

Reuben. A positive precept—a guarantee of liberty and life, requiring only abstinence from one tree.

Olympas. Why was it *positive* and not *moral*, think you?

Reuben. Positive precepts are explicit demands from a sovereign demonstration of his own rights, and of the attachment and allegiance of his subjects. Moral precepts have respect to our fellows, and regulate our duties to them.

Olympas. To test obedience, and to secure privileges, positive precepts are, then, more wise and safe than moral precepts; inasmuch as they simply assert the rights of the sovereign—furnish one argument only—appeal to but one motive—and make the tenure or condition of enjoyment to depend upon a single, clear, and unequivocal action of the subject: and in this case the charter of privileges was so rich and extensive, the restriction so small, the temptation so trivial, that more could not be given nor less required on any principle at all adapted to

God appears as creator simply; in the second, as provider, dispenser, and governor as well as God; and is therefore always called *the Lord God* In the third section he appears more in the character of *Lord*, and generally throughout the book of Genesis. But after these titles are thus clearly introduced and defined in the first three sections, they are frequently used without any apparent regard to their particular meaning. We have, indeed, a very clear representation of God, the Lord, and the Spirit of God, as co-operating in the great work of creation.

prove the loyalty and devotion of man to his Creator and Father.—What, then, was the result, Mary?

Mary. They were subdued by the serpent, and disobeyed God.

Olympas. To what passion, feeling, or desire in them did this serpent address himself?

Mary. To their desire of knowledge. "You shall be as gods, knowing both good and evil?"

Olympas. And what, Mary, have you learned of the author of this temptation?

Mary. The Serpent was the most ingenious and companionable o all the creatures that ministered to man. The Adversary, who was "a liar and a murderer from the beginning," entered into this animal, as he entered into Judas and into many other persons and animals, and made it the instrument of his machinations, and thus deceived our Mother, who, believing a lie rather than the truth of God, obeyed her enemy, and involved her husband with her in the catastrophe.

Olympas. Whence did you learn this?

Mary. Moses describes the Serpent as the most intellectual or subtle of all brutal creations; and had it not been accustomed to speak to man in some way before the hour of temptation, Eve would have been startled and would not have listened to it. But that it was the Old Serpent, the Devil and Satan, that operated by it on the ear and imagination of Eve, we cannot doubt, because of the allusions to it in the New Testament; indeed he is called "*the Tempter*," because of his constant assaults upon mankind, and is denominated "a liar and a murderer from the beginning."

Olympas. Enough now on this subject. They both fell and were expelled from the garden; but not until they were judged and condemned to death. Tell me, Reuben, have we any documentary proof of how long they had lived in Eden?

Reuben. I could not learn from the Bible; but there is an ancient and universal tradition, as I have read somewhere, that they continued only forty days in the garden of delights. The Asiatics say that the reason why the number *forty*, like the number *seven*, has been consecrated, is because of its allusion to this fact. The *seventh* day celebrates the rest of the creation week, and the many mysterious *forties* in both Testaments celebrate or commemorate man's continuance in bliss.

Olympas. I will ask the junior class, in rotation, the forties. Each o you mention some event that required forty days.

Susan. It rained forty days and nights in the beginning of the floo of Noah.

James. Moses was forty days in the Mount with God in receiving the Law.

Henry. He was a second time forty days in getting a second edition of the Law.

Olympas. We shall extend it to the second class:—

William. They were forty days in spying out the promised land.

Mary. The Prophet Elijah fasted forty days.

Edward. Jesus fasted forty days and forty nights.

Eliza. And he was tempted forty days and nights.

Olympas. We must advance into the senior class:—

Thomas Dilworth. Our Saviour abode on earth forty days and nights after his resurrection from the dead.

Reuben Thom. Ezekiel was to lay on his side forty days to bear the iniquity of Judah. "I have," says the Lord, "appointed thee a year for a day."

Olympas. Francis Cush,* can you recall any other remarkable incident of forty days' continuance?

Francis. Forty days were spent in embalming that Joseph who had been a slave, but who died governor of Egypt.

Olympas. There is yet remaining another forty days not mentioned. Rufus, can you think of it?

Rufus. Yes, Master. Jonah the preacher said, "Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be destroyed." But it was not, because they repented during the forty days.

Olympas. But it is not only in respect of days, but of years also, that this number is celebrated. Israel eat manna forty years, wandered in the wilderness forty years, bore their iniquities forty years, were sustained by miracle forty years, &c. Besides this, we have this numeral distinguished in its application to other subjects. Can you recollect any of these subjects, Sarah Black?

Sarah. The Jews were not allowed to inflict more than forty stripes, save one, on those whom they punished.

Olympas. But of these *forties* only a part, like the numbers *three* and *seven*, are of mysterious or allusive import. Such as Moses' forty days in the Mount twice repeated, Elijah's fast of forty days, Christ's fast and temptation of forty days and nights in which he abode on earth, the forty years' sojourn in the wilderness.

The numbers *three* and *seven*, as well as *forty*, are sacred numbers, and of frequent occurrence. In reference to *days*, they are both more frequent than forty; but in their mysterious and allusive character they seem to be equally distingnished. There is, then, reason to think that some most interesting and important *forty*, as well as *three* and *seven*,

* Francis Cush, and Rufus and Sarah Black were slaves.

gave rise to the frequent and mysterious use of that number; and as a very old tradition has pervaded Asia that Adam only continued forty days in Paradise, it is probable that it may have allusion to that; if not, there is no event known to man to which it does relate.

We must leave the geographical allusions and facts in these chapters to another time. But a few general questions which I shall propose to you all for volunteer answer, must close our present lessons. Is there any thing peculiar in the creation of man, from that of other animals?

Edward. Yes, God breathed into his nostrils that which made him a *living soul*—not a mere animal; for they are never said to become living souls. A breath of life they have; but a breath of *lives*, as you say it is in Hebrew, they have not received, which makes them living souls.

Olympas. Can any of you explain what was the power of the Tree of Life?

Thomas Dilworth. It did not give, but preserve life. Without it, Adam in Paradise must have grown old and died. It therefore had the power of always renewing his age, or making him young again as respected his worn or wasted energies—just as ordinary fruit has the power of making us strong after exhaustion.

Olympas. And why was the Tree of Death called the Tree of Knowledge of Good and Evil?

William. Because it gave the experience of evil and of good, and introduced man into a mixed state of good and evil here, to be terminated by death.

Olympas. In what sense did Adam die, in the day of his transgression?

Reuben. He was sentenced or condemned to die; and in law was dead, just as you once told us the antediluvians became *spirits in prison*, whenever the sentence of limitation to 120 years respite was pronounced upon them. To "become mortal" and to die, are said to be two modes of the same expression among Jews.

Olympas. How many things appear to have been taught Adam before his fall?

Edward. The art of speaking, of naming things, what to eat for health and comfort, and how to employ his faculties.

Olympas. We shall resume the subject in the morning, and now let us sing our evening hymn.

A. C.

A NEW DOCTRINE.

Mr. Alexander Campbell,

SIR—I have been a careful reader of your writings, for a long time, and have profited much by your labors; although, as you will perceive by the doctrine which I am about to prove, that, any person believing it, must consider you a very great heretic; and your friend Skinner cannot be regarded in any other or more favorable point of view. I shall not oppose my doctrine to yours, lest you should refuse to give this article a place in the Harbinger, but I will place it in contrast with Mr. Skinner's; and if I shall succeed in producing, at least, as incontestible proof of its truth as did this gentleman of the truth of Universalism, one half of the Universalists ought to abandon his doctrine and adopt mine, that we may be equal on the score of proselytes as well as on the score of proof. My doctrine, sir, is the doctrine of UNIVERSAL DAMNATION. I am not pleased with his circuitous and loose method of arguing; and therefore I will avoid it by coming directly to the point. This is my method:—1st. Prove that all have sinned; and, 2d. That all sinners shall be damned.

In Romans iii. 9. the Apostle Paul says, "We have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin." Be it particularly noticed that the proof is that "all" are under sin—not a *part*, but *all*—that is, the whole. I will not rest the whole of my argument on this one word; for I am not so straitened for proof as to require this. The 14th Psalm is quite to my purpose: "The Lord looked down from heaven upon the children of men, to see if there were any that did understand, and seek God. They are all gone aside; they are altogether become filthy; there is none that doeth good; no, not one." This the Apostle quoted to prove the same proposition which I now labor to prove. But he goes still farther, and convicts them of outrageous sins. He says, "Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips: whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness. Their feet are swift to shed blood: destruction and misery are in their ways; and the way of peace have they not known: there is no fear of God before their eyes." To all this the Apostle adds, "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them that are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and *all the world* may become guilty before God." This is the testimony of David and Paul on the subject of my first proposition. Let us next hear what John says, 1 Epis. v. 19. "The whole world lieth in wickedness." Now for the testimony of the Preacher: —"For there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good, and sinneth not." Eccles. vi. 20. The testimony on this point is clear and full. Even the all-seeing Being himself could not find any that did good—"no, not one." Now suppose we could find it written in the scriptures that the Lord looked down from heaven to see if there were any that should be finally lost, and examination had, he should say, There are none that shall be lost; no, not one. Would not Mr. Skinner consider this incontestible proof of the truth of a universal salvation? Would he not quote it with triumph? If he would, he must admit it as incontrovertible proof of my first proposition; namely, that all have sinned.

I will now proceed to the proof of my 2d proposition—All sinners shall be damned. "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God." Ps. ix. 17. "The ungodly shall not stand in the judgment." Ps. i. 5. "As many as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law, shall be judged by the law." The Lord "will by no means clear the guilty." Ex. xxxiv. 7.

I have now produced proof that "all have sinned and come short of the glory of God"—that the whole world has "become guilty before God"—and that he "will by no means clear the guilty;" but that they "shall be turned into hell." Now, as the Universalists admit that Christ did not come to save people from hell; and as the Apostle affirms that his name is the only "name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved;" does it not follow that there is no salvation for any person, but that a universal damnation awaits the human family? Those who have sinned without law, shall perish without;—those who have sinned in the law, shall be JUDGED by the law; and all have sinned, either without law, or in the law, and the ungodly shall not stand IN THE JUDGMENT. Of course they must fall. Into what place? Response by the scriptures—*Into hell.*

Now, Mr. Campbell, if I have not proved the doctrine of universal damnation clearly and unequivocally, then no man can prove its opposite. Let me appeal to you, sir, as you neither believe Mr. Skinner's doctrine nor mine, and consequently you are an impartial umpire between us—am I not justly and honorably entitled to one-half of all the Universalists, since I have proved my doctrine as clearly and as fairly from the scriptures as Mr. Skinner, or any other man, ever proved his?

S. E. S.

LE ROY, Pa. December 19, 1839.

THE APOSTOLIC AGE OF THE CHURCH.

THERE was at first no distinction of sects and opinions in the church; she knew no difference of men, but good and bad; there was no separation made, but what was made by piety or impiety; or, which is all one, by fidelity and infidelity. The kingdom of God did not then consist in words, but in power—the power of godliness; though now we are fallen into another method. We have turned all religion into faith, and our faith is nothing but the productions of interest or disputing. It is adhering to a party, and a wrangling against all the world beside; and when it is asked of what religion he is, we understand the meaning to be—What faction does he follow? What are the articles of his sect? Not—What is the manner of his life? And if men be zealous for their party and that interest, then they are precious men, though otherwise they be covetous as the grave, factious as Dathan, schismatical as Corah, or proud as the fallen angels.

[*Bishop Jeremy Taylor,*]

DEFINITIONS AND ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS—*No. I.*

"WHAT is a *Unitarian?*" Etymologically it means one that believes in unity—in simple unity, without regard to person, place, or thing. Technically it denotes one that is opposed to trinity or triunity in the godhead or deity. All Christians say that "there is but one God, and one Mediator between God and men—the man Christ Jesus." But he is more than a man, more than an inspired man, more than an angelic man, more than any created thing. These theories have different names—such as Humanitarian, Socinian, Arian, Semi-Arian, &c. But we enter not into the merits of these shadows of shades of metaphysical abstractions.

I use the term *Unitarian* in its *obnoxious* sense, as indicating one who regards the death of Christ as not for sins, nor for sinners; but for a proof of his sincerity and benevolence. With the real Unitarian no real sin-offering, no real atonement was needed; and therefore Christ died as a martyr. This, with me, is *practically* no better than theism. Indeed, such a person says he does not believe "that Jesus died *for* our sins;" or "that he, the Just One, suffered for the unjust."

Many theists believe that Jesus Christ lived and died in Judea, at the time affirmed, and that he was a great reformer—a pious and excellent man—liberally inspired, as other sages were—and that he was slain by the hands of wicked Jews and Romans. Thomas Jefferson and Thomas Paine both believed all this; but they laughed to scorn the idea of his dying for sin as an atoning sacrifice.

Many persons have been called Unitarians, and some have so called themselves, who believe in the death of Christ as a sin-offering, who reject trinitarianism because of its unscriptural, unintelligible, and barbarous phraseology; regarding it as a system of polytheism; who, nevertheless, know not what to say or think of the pre-existent or ante-human state of the author of Christianity; some repudiating the phrases "eternal son," "second person," "consubstantial," "co-equal," "very God of very God," "Supreme Deity," &c. &c. They reject these terms because to them barbarous and incomprehensible; but have no distinct idea or name for the antecedent state, relation, or character of Him that was made flesh. These differ, in my judgment, very materially from the Unitarian, who has no other use for Jesus than as a prophet, a king, or a martyr; therefore virtually rejecting every thing that concerns his high priesthood. The phrase "Supreme Deity" is, to my mind, perfectly Pagan. What! have we got one upreme Jove with his retinue of inferior gods and demi-gods! I was

once asked by a very conceited and self-confident preacher, whether I believed that Jesus was the *Supreme* God? Had it not been in a worshipping assembly, I would have asked him how many *inferior* gods he acknowledged? I neither believe in one supreme god, or more. The term *Jehovah* is itself indicative of the supreme. What would any sensible person say to him that asked him, 'Sir, do you believe that Jesus Christ was a *human* man—a *supreme* man!' Would he not reply, 'Sir, with me, *man is man*. I know nothing of supreme humanity, nor of supreme divinity. If any being be human, he is human; if he be divine, he is divine, possessed of a nature which has no positive, comparative, or superlative degrees in it. Indeed, what nature has in it degrees of comparison! It is not the divine, the angelic, the human.' I have long taught that the Trinitarian, Arian, and Sabellian theories are wholly a corrupt speech—irrational and unscriptural speculations.

But there is this difference: All Trinitarians believe in the divine nature of Jesus Christ, and in his death as a real sacrifice for sin—an expiatory offering, without which there could be no remission. I believe this most sincerely, but without any fellowship for their humanisms, their barbarous diction, and unscriptural modes of reasoning on the subject. Therefore that Unitarianism which I repudiate denies both the *divine nature* of my Redeemer, and the necessity of his death as a *sin-offering in order to remission.*

It is long since we proposed to abandon all this style, and to call Bible things by Bible names. Our brethren have generally agreed to do so; but in their definition of certain Bible names, I have sometimes seen a sense imposed upon them wholly modern, and which would ultimate in a doctrine as certainly unapostolic as either Arianism or Trinitarianism.

I have therefore suggested to the propounder of this question, and to others who seem to object to my style as too Trinitarian—that a calm, discreet, affectionate, fraternal, and unimpassioned discussion of the terms "sin," "sin-offering," "sacrifice for sin," "atonement," "propitiation," "reconciliation," "expiation," (or purification, for they are two versions of the same word,) "redemption," "remission," "righteousness of God," "Mediator," "Redeemer,"—would tend very much to the edification of the brethren, and to a more perfect union of all the elements of modern partyism which have been associated under the banners of Reformation.

I have accordingly proposed to have an aged brother, an old student of the Bible, well versed in these matters, to write four pages per month for the Harbinger; and should any difference occur, I will occupy four

pages in biblical criticism upon such terms as may not be by us understood in the same sense.

All this can be done without the least interruptionof the most perfect Christian feeling and obliging good manners. And thus may we help one another forward on our journey out of the labyrinths of false philosophy, false philology, and false theology; and concentrate not only our own minds, but those of all the brethren, on the study of the holy scriptures, and the immense and soul-absorbing themes represented by those celestial terms which I have collected in this essay.

I will only add that I have addresse l, not long since. our amiable, learned, and greatly venerated Elder B. W. Stone, who has propounded this question on this subject, before I knew that he was about to revive the "Christian Messenger." And as the matter can have a more extensive hearing in this paper than in any other, I proposed it to be the medium of communication. Besides, I have in the present number. before I heard of his intentions, given reasons why I must object to a discussion going on in two papers as holding opposite sides on any question whatever.

I therefore most respectfully and affectionately solicit from him an essay on Sin and Sin-Offerings, exegetically and philologically, (or, if any one prefer a more intelligible style,) scripturally setting forth the import of these terms in sacred writ. I must limit the essays to four octavo pages each. A. C.

QUESTIONS AND DEFINITIONS—*No. II.*

[The following are from Amelia county, Virginiaa.]

Question 2. What was that *promise* referred to Heb. xi. 39., which none of the ancient saints had received?—"These all having obtained a good report through faith, did not receive *the promise.*"

Answer. The promise here stands for *the thing promised*, or for its accomplishment. So in other places:—"When the time of the promise drew nigh," Acts vii. 17.—i. e. its accomplishment. "I send the promise," Luke xxiv. 49.,—the thing promised.

What, then, was the thing promised? Not Canaan, because most of all these men of faith and mighty deeds had lived and died in it, but the thing signified and prefigured in the promised land. Now what that was, Paul and his cloud of witnesses shall declare. Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Sarah, all "died in faith," not of Canaan, for they lived and died in it; but of certain good things promised to them through

this type. These things they saw "*afar off*"—farther than two or three centuries; and, embracing them, "they confessed," by their conduct, that, even in the covenanted land, they were strangers and pilgrims; plainly declaring, as Paul affirms, though obscurely to many of us—plainly declaring that they sought something better than Canaan; that they saw and earnestly sought a better—that is, a heavenly inheritance. It was not the land that they had forsaken, any more than the land which they occupied; for, as Paul says, had they desired that, they had opportunity to return; but, says he, in truth they desired a better—a heavenly country. God, therefore, is called "their God," and "has prepared for them a city." This heavenly city and inheritance, seen afar off through the type of Canaan, and ardently embraced by a faith which confidently expects its object, as well as sees it, was the promise which all the men of faith of the olden time believed, expected, and joyfully cherished, but did not receive while yet they lived in the land of Canaan. Though other "promises were obtained," and accomplished to them, this of an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and unfading, remained in hope.

Paul in Heb. xi. greatly enlarges our views of the things seen afar off by the believing ancients. Noah became "heir of the righteousness which is by faith"—Abraham expected a city founded and builded by God alone—Isaac, Jacob, Sarah, earnestly desired a "heavenly country"—Abraham saw the resurrection of the dead in a figure—Moses esteemed the reproach for Christ greater treasures than those of Egypt. He saw the invisible God, and endured persecution, looking off to the promised retribution in another life—Women would not, in a cowardly manner, escape from the horrors of persecution, that they might obtain a "*better resurrection.*" Yet none of all these received this promise. They obtained renown by their faith; but not the promised eternal inheritance.

Question 3. What the *better thing* provided for us?—"God," says Paul, "having promised something better for us." ver. 40.

It is not something better than the eternal inheritance; for nothing can be better than that; and both they and we shall finally attain to the same inheritance. But, in the meantime, as if parenthetically, Paul says we have a better covenant, established on better promises, administered by a better Mediator, affording us brighter and better developments of this anticipated inheritance; consequently affording stronger incentives to the mighty deeds of faith than that dispensation under which they cherished this hope; for they and we will be *perfected* at the same time.

Question 4. What is the *perfection* spoken of, verse 40? "That they without us should not be made *perfect.*

The completion of man must necessarily precede his perfection; and this cannot possibly occur till new heavens and a new earth are created, and man is raised from the dead, bearing the image of the Lord from heaven: for the perfection of man is the perfection of body, soul, and spirit, which cannot possibly precede the resurrection of the incorruptible, immortal, and spiritual bodies of the saints.

Now in this the ancient saints will not anticipate us. Had they obtained this promise, then, indeed, God would have provided something better for them than for us. Their spirits are with the Lord, and made perfect; but their bodies are in their graves, waiting a new creation; and therefore they were not made perfect at death. God then, indeed, has provided something better for us—a better dispensation of grace—clearer light, brighter prospects. Life and immortality are made evident by the gospel. We have illustrated, in the resurrection and perfection of the Lord's body, as well as proved what they expected; and besides, without us, and before us, they shall not be raised from the dead, nor glorified in their persons. They and we shall be glorified together.

Other questions from our Amelia correspondent in our next. A. C.

"I GO A-FISHING."

PETER was afraid of suffering for food and raiment if he continued to preach after his Master's ascension: and, surrounded as he was by the most unpromising circumstances, without making a fair trial of the promise, "Lo I am with you always," resolves to abandon his high calling, and resume his former occupation, by which he had previously earned his bread. Now whether he was blameworthy or not, is of no consequence to me, since I have coolly and cautiously adopted his resolution—to "go a-fishing" as long as religious matters wear the aspect they do at present. Can a rational man find fault with one for abandoning a profession which, under the present constitution of things, must inevitably beggar himself and family? And yet there are not a few who consider a young man wofully alienated from God, who turns again to his shop, his farm, or his merchandize, after having expended all he possessed in proclaiming the gospel, without the faintest prospect of receiving as much as ten dollars per annum for his support. To declare an eternal non-fellowship for the selfishness and avarice of a large proportion of the religious world, is not, in my opinion, less or more than the reasonable and imperative duty of every enlightened Christian. A person proud of the name of Christian, and foremost in all *vocal* duties, professing to enjoy great blessings under

the gospel, abounding in all worldly goods, and yet grudging the miserable niggardly sum he devotes to the spread of the gospel, is as unworthy of the Christian profession as his conduct is dishonorable to it. And how many such could I count within the circle of my acquaintance! A preacher, too, who has patience to starve himself and family to death, while preaching to an opulent and avaricious church, when the god of this world will give him an honorable and honest living, is a person not much to be pitied. And lastly, a person who is silly enough to be persuaded to join himself to the former, by the arguments of the latter, is likely to become a good companion by further following their pernicious examples.

So, then, I am resolved to "go a-fishing" until Christians show themselves as willing to support preachers, as they are anxious to have them preach. B.

LETTER FROM CYRUS BOSWORTH.

WARREN, December 3, 1839.

Beloved brother Arny,

MAY grace, mercy, and peace be abundantly multiplied to you and yours!

Enclosed I most respectfully and affectionately return to you the favor received in your very courteous letter by the hand of brother M., not aware that I should do any more for the good cause we have espoused with, than without it: believing that as I have been prospered I can and ought to spend about one half of my time without aid from the brethren; and more than that I think I could not with propriety be absent from my family. I certainly was most abundantly rewarded for any time and labor I spent while I was with the brethren, with the richest and the only reward I desired on earth. I, however, bless the Lord that you have put it in my power to know *at once* both the blessedness of receiving and giving. The *favor* you, "in behalf of the brethren, request me to accept" (as you are pleased to say) "as a slight token of your respect and Christian regard;" adding, "We only regret our circumstances and means will not permit us to give a weightier expression of our regard and esteem for you and your services." Its reception stirred within me emotions both of pleasure and pain:—of pleasure, that I thus had *increased* reason for gratitude and praise to our heavenly Father upon every remembrance of the brethren: of pain, that whether I have reference to myself personally, or to the services in weakness rendered, I have so little merited so tangible a token of regard, so unexpectedly and affectionately tendered. This came through your hands from the *brethren*. *Many* a soul-stirring thought starts from this *one*. What? Was this a token of Christian love from all the brethren in your respective churches? Having "tasted that the Lord is gracious, loving him with the whole heart, and the brethren with pure hearts fervently," did their love for their neighbors, for all men, prompt them one and all to cast into the "treasury of the Lord" from their substance, as he had respectively prospered them, means to sustain others in holding forth the word of life? And did this flow

from each heart a free-will offering to the Lord, and through you to the brethren laboring in word and doctrine, at *their instance by them sustained*, and from them as a token of their love and liberality reached me? Then, indeed, has there been found a means of knitting my heart to each heart by another invisible, but I trust *imperishable chord*, and back again on each unbroken string *to each* would I return the token with thanks to God, and with love unfeigned to them. Was there thus cast in the widow's mite, the orphan's saving, and had all the little ones who have put on the Saviour "a part and lot in this matter"? Then to each of them would I return special thanks, with tears of sympathy and love, praying that they may be preserved blameless and harmless until the glorious coming and kingdom of our Lord and Saviour, whose rewards are with him to give to every one according to his deeds"—who sees not as man sees, but who saw the poor widow cast into the treasury more than all that were rich. Oh! who would not lay up treasure in heaven, where the poor who are rich in faith may make themselves rich in "*durable riches and righteousness!*" Who would have a religion, have preaching, or partake of the memorials at the Lord's table, that costs them nothing, and thus cheat themselves out of the blessings consequent in doing duties, or rather in participating in privileges! So would not David, that "man after God's own heart." "And the king said unto Arannah, Nay, *but I will surely buy it of thee at a price;* neither will I offer burnt offerings unto the Lord my God of that which *doth cost me nothing*," 2 Sam. xxiv. 24. I choose not to permit myself to doubt for a single moment after all I had heard of the genial influences of a southern sun in warming the human heart, and causing it to expand with liberality; and after all I have seen in "less propitious skies" of the expanding influences of the gospel, that the gift tendered me had been firstly tendered to the Lord from the whole brotherhood within your co-operating district; and that all, to a man, woman, and child, both *recognize* and *act* upon the great fundamental principle laid down by the great Apostles—"Let not one be burdened that another may be eased." I choose not to let Satan strip me of three-fourths of all the joy I feel on this occasion by suggesting the thought that perhaps there was not more than one-fourth of the brethren that had any "part or lot in the matter." No, indeed: "Get thee behind me, Satan," while I rejoice that there is at least one precious spot on earth where the brethren all heartily co operate as one man to further the cause of Christ—where all possess the noble principle of the "Psalmist of Israel, and *would not—could not* consent to have aught of time or money "*sacrificed to the Lord their God, that cost them nothing.*"

I shall indulge in the thought that I shall be permitted to see them again before I die. Who can reflect on what the Lord has done for us, and be content without doing something every day for his cause? And yet I know some churches in which there are some brethren in *name*, out of whose hearts the demon of covetousness seems not to have been wholly cast, or kept—in which, if aught incurring expense is to be done, it is to be done by the *few*—not by the *many*, Is not this the kind, think you, that only "goeth out by prayer and fasting"? Dear Lord, and can such ever live at this poor dying rate? But to you and to all the holy brethren would I say from the heart, as said Paul to

the Corinthian brethren, "Now he that ministereth seed to the sower both minister bread for your food and multiply your seed sown, and increase the fruits of your righteousness!"

"May the peace of God, which the world cannot give nor take away," be and remain with you all!

CYRUS BOSWORTH.

W. F. M. ARNY TO C. BOSWORTH.

BETHANY, VA. January, 1840.

Dear Brother—May grace, mercy, and peace be multiplied to you and yours from God the Father, through Christ Jesus our Lord!

Yours of the 3d of December, returning the contribution for your labors in the gospel in this region, has been received. The brethren will doubtless appreciate the feelings and motives which have induced you to decline receiving this compensation. As it is nevertheless your due, I have in your name contributed it to a fund we are about to raise for the purpose of assisting laboring brethren who are in embarrassed circumstances.

There is no principle more honorable to the professor than that which actuated the illustrious David, when, as you quote, he declared that he would not "offer sacrifice to the Lord of that which cost him nothing." Such a saying was perfectly accordant with the character of him who gave to the Lord the richest offering ever made by mortal man.

We have determined to reform; and for this purpose have constituted three funds in our church:—The one, an annual contribution for the purpose of paying the expenses of the Lord's house and table. This is a contribution *equally* expected from rich and poor: the most indigent disciple pays just as much as the wealthiest, and all are thus placed on *an equal footing in the Lord's house.*

The second, "the fellowship," or contribution for the poor. This is attended to every Lord's day, and each disciple gives, as the Lord has prospered him. This fund is appropriated for no other purpose than first, to aid the *poor brethren;* secondly, to assist the *poor in our neighborhood.*

The third is what we term "The Evangelist Fund." To this each disciple contributes as he feels able; which fund is kept for the purpose of sustaining those who labor in word and teaching.

Men in general do not feel or reason as did David and Paul in relation to building up the church, the spiritual temple of God. On the contrary, they think they are offering a sacrifice to God in the *time they spend at meeting for their own improvement.* Nay, they even suppose that at and by the very same time, they are rewarding the preacher for his labors in simply listening to his discourses. "It is as much trouble for us," they argue, "to go and hear the preacher, as it is for him to come and preach." But how, think you, would one of these reasoners relish his own logic were he an inn-keeper, and to receive, upon demanding compensation from his boarders, the following reply:—"Sir, it is no more trouble for you to furnish your table with provisions, than it is for us to come and eat. We regard your demand, therefore, as unreasonable and unjust, and will not agree to settle on any other

terms than simply by balancing the account?" Would not such conduct in worldly matters be esteemed irrational and dishonest? And is it less so in religious concerns? Alas! how over-rated are carnal things in this age! How undervalued spiritual things!

The preacher himself, nevertheless, must have somewhat to offer. The Christian religion began in sacrifice, and will be sustained by it. He, therefore, is not to be denied the privilege of making a sacrifice. It must, however, be a *voluntary* one. And how costly a one is his protracted absence from home both to him and to his family! He can not and ought not *voluntarily* to superadd to this the very means by which he and his family are supported. This were to involve pecuniary embarrassment, and a consequent non-compliance with lawful and necessary engagements; by which delinquency his profession would be dishonored and his preaching nullified. If, however, a preacher can pursue his worldly avocations abroad, or is in such circumstances as to be able to devote the whole, or a portion of his time, without interfering with the support of his family, he is certainly at liberty to make this sacrifice also. It must, however, always be voluntary on his part, and it does not by any means release the brethren from their duties and obligations.

It is to be hoped that all these matters will be duly considered by the brethren, who are a means, in the providence of God, of holding forth the word of life and calling sinners to reformation. If all in every place, would, as you suggest, take part in this good work, how soon we should see the truth every where triumphant! May the Lord hasten that happy period, and the fulfilment of his great and precious promises, is the prayer of yours in hope!

W. F. M. ARNY.

THOUGHTS ON EVIDENCE—*No. III.*

Brother Campbell—

The inquiry to which I would invite the attention of your readers, is, as before stated, whether or not the evidence of oral or written testimony is less conclusive than that of sense or consciousness. It is to be observed that the question relates to the kind or species of evidence, and not to the degree or amount of it. That is to say, it is not whether the person who hears the report of a *single* witness touching any transaction ought to be less certain of it than if he had witnessed it himself; but whether oral or written testimony, in any amount, be really incompetent to produce an assurance or conviction as firm and indubitable in all respects as may be derived by an individual from the exercise of his own senses or consciousness.

We affirm that human testimony is greatly undervalued, and that it may be as fully depended upon, (of course when in the proper measure,) as any other kind of evidence. This proposition will be sus-

tained indirectly by proving that other kinds of evidence are over-rated This we have already argued from the popular views of the religious world respecting faith, which confound it with knowledge; from the abortive attempt to apply mathematical reasoning to religion; and from the improper selection and application of scholastic terms. The remainder of this paper will be occupied with certain reasons on account of which we might naturally expect men to be prejudiced in favor of the evidence of sense.

In the first place, such a prejudice arises from that self-esteem of which every one is more or less possessed. Every one is prone to regard himself as superior to others, and of course supposes that his senses and discriminating powers partake of this general perfection or superiority. Thus B relates to A a fact of which he was a witness. A, however, thinks, because he is the first letter of the alphabet, or for some other reason equally convincing, that his five senses are much more acute than those of B; his perception much more accurate, and his judgment more discriminating; and concludes that had he been present himself upon the occasion there would have been far less danger of any mistake. When the case is reversed, B is found to entertain the same feeling with respect to A; so that each party, from an overweening confidence in himself, undervalues the other's testimony—though both be equally credible.

Another reason of this prejudice is, that men often mistake the *vividness* of an impression for its *accuracy*. When an object is presented to the senses the attention is roused to greater activity, and a greater number of faculties are called into action, than when a verbal or written account is given. In consequence, the impression is much more lively, and the individual is led to suppose it equally superior in correctness. Yet, after all, its superiority may consist in nothing but its greater vividness. When minutely examined, the impression derived from testimony, however faint, will correspond with that made through the senses in every particular.

Again: As sensible evidence is considered infallible, it follows naturally that whatever mistakes are committed will be laid to the door of human testimony; thus serving to depreciate still more the latter and to exalt the former. It will be obvious that errors may occur both in the original perception of a fact, and in its communication to another through the sense of hearing. A fact or object may be perceived imperfectly or inaccurately from various causes; such as distance, false associations, inattention, or imperfection of vision. The impression received may be correctly reported; yet when it is found to be incorrect, the fault will be adjudged to the report rather than to

the perception. On the other hand, a matter may be both perceived and reported correctly; yet the auditor, from some of the causes just mentioned, or an imperfection of the sense of hearing, may receive a false impression, which in like manner will be charged to the report. There can be no doubt that many cases such as these occur, as any one may assure himself from an examination of juridical proceedings or from his own experience. There is much hurried and careless observation; quite as much, I doubt not, as there is incorrect relation or report of true perception. When men are charged with having erred from imperfect perception of a fact, they will, in nine cases out of ten, charge their accuser with the same error of perception in hearing their report. In both instances the senses are chargeable, yet both parties will at last compromise the matter, and lay the whole blame upon the uncertainty of human testimony.

I will now show that the senses are not infallible, and that an individual may in certain cases be compelled even to rely more upon the testimony of a single witness than upon the evidence of his own senses.

R. R.

News from the Churches.

Bagg's Store, Lowndes county, Alabama, Dec. 15, 1839.

The good cause is advancing rapidly, even in the midst of cotton and Negroes, which is the mania of the South. I have been evangelizing this year, say not more than nine months, during which upwards of 20 have been immersed. Brother Butler has immersed as many more, besides other accessions. Brother J. M. Barnes reached this place two days ago. He intends settling permanently in this county. Thank the Lord for our increasing strength!

JAMES H CURTIS.

Lexington, Kentucky, December 22, 1839.

On Friday evening last I returned from a protracted meeting of two weeks' continuance, at Winchester. It was commenced by brethren A. Raines and J. Morton on Friday the 13th I arrived on the Lord's day evening following. Monday evening brother J. Rogers arrived. Wednesday morning I was left alone, all the rest having retired to other appointments

I preached twice a-day for nine days; and by the grace of God sixteen persons became obedient to the faith. Though the weather was a part of the time excessively cold, and the ice three or four inches thick, the young and timid females did not hesitate to be buried with the Lord in baptism. The brethren say we have never had so general and favorable a hearing in Winchester before. I hope much additional good may be the result.

B. F. HALL.

Warren county, Illinois, December 13, 1839.

Since my communication of June last I have visited Marion and Lewis counties, Mo., where I labored jointly with brother Ballinger, of Marion county, and brother Rigdon, of Fulton, Illinois. Upwards of 40 have been added by immersion; and some from the sects have united with us. Much prejudice has been removed from many minds, and prospects good for a future harvest. Since brother Rigdon last wrote to you, there has been twelve or fourteen added to the church on Bear creek, Adams county. May the Lord still continue to bless our labors, and to his name be the praise!

LIVY HATCHITT.

Paris, Kentucky, December 26, 1839

There were five accessions to this church this week under the preaching of brother Ricketts, all young men; one the week before, under brother Rogers; and one not long since, when I preached here. AYLETT RAINES.

Georgetown, Kentucky, December 23, 1839.

Since the report of the Beasly meeting, near Maysville, at which 18 additions were made to the good cause of the Lord, I have just closed a meeting of 8 days at Minerva, near the same place, at which we obtained 23 accessions The prospects are more auspicious than when we commenced; and I hope to be able to visit Germantown and Dover, in the same neighborhood, within a few weeks. I know it will rejoice you to hear of this good news. Let us, one and all, unite in prayer and effort, for the success of the gospel. The Lord will hear and grant our petitions.

Brother Campbell, I meddle not with the speculations of men. The Lord being my helper, I have resolved to cultivate the spirit of love for my brethren and for all men; and to endeavor to act the practical part in my efforts to redeem mankind from the degeneracy of the times and the pollution of sin. J. J. JOHNSON.

EXTRACT FROM THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER,

[*England.*]

NOTE.—If brother Campbell, in connexion with one or more of our American brethren, could devote six or nine months of the ensuing year, for the purpose of proclaiming the ancient gospel and order of worship through the united kingdom, great would be the result. Hundreds, if not thousands, would be scripturally brought into the glorious liberty of the sons of God—realizing the one hope, finally to attain which, no sacrifice can be too great. May the Lord, in his providence, open the way for such a consummation!

BROTHER WALLIS and the brethren with him deserve to be assisted in the good work to which they have devoted themselves so earnestly and so successfully. I could, indeed, most cheerfully, so far as the will is concerned, visit these brethren and labor with and for them for a year. But at present my hands are full with matters so various and complex, claiming my personal attention at home, as to forbid my undertaking a tour through England during the year just now commenced. Two excellent brethren have, however, been stirred up, for some time on this subject. They are desirous of helping the weak and of laboring in fields not much cultivated. Brother *Matthew Clapp*, of Ohio, and brother *E. A. Smith*, of Kentucky, men of good Christian knowledge, faith, zeal, and piety, and of unblemished reputation, are thinking of visiting England next spring; and I trust they will prepare themselves for that field, and be countenanced and sent by their respective churches. They are both free from all domestic entanglements, and greatly interested in being well approved by the Lord at his coming, and by all the holy brethren. I trust they will be assisted in this pious and benevolent enterprize, and go and see and encourage the hearts of those beloved brethren in the land of our forefathers. I do not mean that they should be sent by all the churches of Christ in America, nor even in one State. In such an event more would be expected, and a choice of many would be prerequisite; but as pioneers, and prefatory to such a delegation, I think they ought to be encouraged by their own immediate churches and such benevolent individuals as would delight in such a voluntary generous enterprize on their part.

If our English and European brethren keep to the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible—call no man on earth Master—

avoid all idle and untaught questions and speculations about things unrevealed, and be on their guard lest any one should make a prey of them through an empty and deceitful philosophy, after the rudiments of this world—after the tradition of men, and not after Christ, I will make an effort to see them, if the Lord will, before many years shall have run their round. But knowing there are many purposes in the heart of a man which shall never be consummated, I leave all in the hand of my sovereign Lord the King. A. C.

BISHOP PURCELL AND HIS OHIO DIOCESE.

Since our debate, the Bishop has been to see the Pope; and, no doubt, has received his reward for his apology for the deformities of the Papal hierarchy. The following notice of his tour and his accessions to and in aid of the cause, are deserving of notice:—

A. C.

BISHOP PURCELL'S VISIT TO ROME.

We ask the Protestants of Fredrick to read with candor and attention the following extract from the Catholic Herald, and then to answer the question, Whether the Romish Bishops and Clergy in this country are not minions of the Pope of Rome—whether they are not under such obligations to a *foreign* Pontiff as to render it impossible for them to be faithful subjects of any other country or government? No one will say we do them injustice, when we extract from their own paper, the organ of their own church in this country. Here follows the extract, under the head of 'Ecclesiastical Intelligence,' from the L'Ami de la Religion, which we published in the Vindicator, No. 7, page 160. The Visitor goes on—

"Now only think, a *pretendad* American citizen at Rome a foreign court—holding 'interviews with the Holy Father,' the Pope, on the state of religion—Popery in the United States!—receiving from this foreign Prince 'precious relics, richly embossed!'—We should like to know what these precious relics are; no doubt we shall find out in due time. We also published a list in the above number of the Vindicator, in anticipation of these precious humbugs, from the pen of our respected convert Scrutator, who is well versed in the means employed by these Jesuits, to pick the pockets of their poor deluded priestridden followers.

"But more still: Purcell was 'named Assistant Bishop to the Throne.' Aye! the Pope has his *throne*, and Purcell is an assistant to that throne, and yet resides in the United States, and exercises authority over the *free* people of this Republic! A man who is an assistant to a foreign Prince, reigning in our country! O! ye freeborn Americans, how does this sound in your ears? But this is not all:—

"The Pope addressed to the Bishop 'a brief containing *most extensive powers!*' What are these powers? Let Protestants sleep a little longer, and they will find out with a vengeance what these powers are.

"Still more: The Bishop's tour has not been without benefit to his own diocese!' No doubt his pockets have been well filled with Austrian gold, to aid in pulling down republicanism and liberty in our land The power and the purse are now in his hands, and he can go to work in earnest, and to some purpose. Yet still more:—

"'He returns with eight new missionaries!' Right from Rome with eight new missionaries manufactured in a foreign land, under a monarchical government—at Rome, the very hot-bed of Popery, and under many oaths and obligations to the Holy Father! Here are men who are brought into our country to disseminate the doctrines and principles of Rome, and support that system of idolatry, iniquity, and oppression. Please read again this extract, and then ask yourselves in the name of our country, our liberties, and our religion, what is our duty?" *Fredrick Visitor.*

DR. PETERS AND THE AMERICAN B. REPOSITORY.

Since the first form of this number was to press, we have received a letter from Dr. Absalom Peters, Editor of the American Biblical Repository, explanatory and apologetic of its course in relation to R. W.

Landis, of Pennsylvania, with the tender of a few pages in the April number of said work, to state my views and actions as assailed and misrepresented by the Rev. R. W. Landis. I am thankful for this unexpected justice, even at this late day, and of course will embrace the opportunity offered.

Touching Mr. Landis himself, the author of these calumnies, things remain as they were. I hope he may be brought to genuine repentance, and also offer an apology for his sins against me, and thus render unnecessary farther procedure in his case. A. C.

OBITUARY.

Hillsborough, King & Queen, Dec. 29. 1839.

Dear brother Campbell—I have just returned home after the interring of our beloved brother Philip B. Pendleton. He left us on yesterday, about 11 o'clock, after a protracted illness of six or eight weeks. He fell asleep prepared and resigned to enter the silent grave, and wait for the arch-angel's trumpet to call him forth to be judged of the deeds done in the body. He is well known to you and a number of our brethren in the West. I feel his loss in the church of Smyrna more than that of any man I ever before had to part with. He was an active Deacon, a man of liberal sentiments and a generous heart. He was always ready to every work he believed to be good—a friend to the poor. He has left a beloved wife with four children to experience their loss, with a numerous circle of friends. May our God supply his place in the church of Smyrna by raising up some one as active, zealous, and useful as was Philip B Pendleton, according to my judgment. THOMAS M. HENLEY.

The above tidings were to me as unexpected as unwelcome. Alas! what frail and feeble creatures we are! Surely all flesh is grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of the grass. The grass withers, and the flower thereof fades, and droops, and disappears! Lord, teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts to wisdom! Brother Pendleton (I knew him well) was an early—a decided, a constant pleader for the reformation principles. Greatly devoted to the truth, he sought it with ardor and divulged it with pleasure. He will be long remembered by a large circle, by whom his decease is now lamented. But why should we grieve? He has fallen asleep in the Lord and gone to rest. May the Lord remember in mercy his surviving relict and bereaved children! A. C.

H. S. HUBBELL

Richmond, November 13, 1839.

Brother Henshall:

Dear Sir—Being appointed by our congregation to make report of the following matter; we therefore wish through your paper to inform those whose interest it is to know, that a certain individual calling himself *H. S. Hubbell*, and professing to be a disciple of Christ, and who acknowledged himself to be the same person published by Joseph Ash and A. Campbell, in the September Harbinger: presented himself on the 2d instant before the congregation of Christ at Liberty, Prince Edward with a view to our fellowship. After attending to his explanation of certain charges, preferred against him by two of our body, touching his manners and doctrines, we then demanded his credentials; which, after due examination in connexion with his doctrine, manners, and the Harbinger publication, were decided to be unsatisfactory.

He was, moreover, charged by one of our body with being a speculatist, self lover, bigot, dogmatist, no-devilist, and a denier of Christ's existence before his birth, and of his "death for our sins according to the scriptures:" against which he made little or no defence.

Brother Albert Anderson was present, and not only approved our proceedings, but on the day following publicly commended and thanked the congregation. Mr. Hubbell left us on the next day and went off apparently in ill humor, and not without some intimations of revenge; so that we expect some honor from him in the way of publication.

By order of the Congregation—

R. H. DEJARNETT,
WM. DOSWELL,
WM. S. WILSON, } *Committee.*

PROSPECTUS
OF
THE CHRISTIAN PUBLISHER.

The subscribers have determined to continue the *Christian Publisher*, which was conducted the first two years of its existence by R. L. Coleman, and the last year by James Henshall.

It will defend the authenticity and credibility of the books of the inspired volume, and continue to plead for the Christianity developed on their sacred pages.

The restoration of the ancient gospel, the worship, the spirit, and the manners of the primitive disciples of Christ, will be its aim.

To effect this important end, it may, and doubtless will devolve upon us, to unmask error and expose its deformity, and to animadvert upon the human inventions, contrivances, and practices of this age, celebrated for the number of devices and expedients to which it has given birth. But while we shall not shrink from the performance of these ungrateful duties, we shall studiously watch that we be not beguiled into the exercise of an acrimonious spirit at war with the Christian character.

We shall labor to bring back all *believers* to that faith and practice enforced by the Apostles: for we believe that this alone furnishes a substantial and holy basis for their universal coalition into one great heavenly family.

Subservient to this glorious end, so much to be desired, the following items shall be attended to, viz.—

1. That every human institution, however deeply laid in human wisdom and philosophy, is utterly unequal to the mighty task of effecting this glorious reformation.
2. That the Holy Scriptures must occupy an unrivalled importance in the mind of every candidate for life and immortality.
3. The re-publication of what we may deem interesting and useful to our readers.
4. The various movements, tendencies, and changes of the numerous and powerful religious combinations around us.
5. The history of the triumphs and spread of the truth.
6. The defence of the gospel facts against the insidious attacks of infidel cavillers.
7. The defence of gospel institutions, in all their forms and bearings, from the perversions of corrupters.
8. The defence of the character of the disciples, both collectively and individually, from the aspersions of designing men.

TERMS.—1. Each number will contain 24 pages. 2. It will be issued on the first Monday in every month. 3. The subscription price will be one dollar in advance. 4. All persons who obtain and pay in advance for six subscribers, shall be entitled to one copy gratis. 5. All persons who do not notify their discontinuance to us a month before the close of each volume, will be considered subscribers for the next.

The paper is now in press and ready to be issued. We shall send it to all the old subscribers, and unless it be returned, we shall consider that they wish to continue it.

☞ All letters, to receive attention, must be post-paid.

R. L. COLEMAN.
J. W. GOSS

Charlottesville, Va., January 1, 1840.

The Christian Publisher has always been a very temperate, decided, and faithful advocate of the principles of the current reformation, and I have no doubt of its continuance to be so; nor, indeed, of its improvement in the hands of its present Editors. A. C.

☞ Brother *Carey Smith* desires his brethren and friends in Ohio and Indiana, to know that he is now in good health and laboring in Mississippi, and will likely locate somewhere near Woodville. At a meeting which he attended at Consolation, shortly after his arrival, four were added to the church. We are happy to learn that brother Matthews is about devoting himself wholly to the work of the Lord. He is able to do much, and there is much need for all that he can do in all the region round about his location. A. C.

The following appeared on the cover of the January number:—I did not observe in time for correction within this number, that certain very strong, and, to my mind, highly revolting, unjust, and unwarrantable expressions concerning debt and slaveholders, intended to have been erased from a sermon otherwise valuable, copied from the Oberlin Evangelist into the December number, were not expunged. This occurred in my haste in laying out copy for my compositor on the eve of my departure for my late visit to Kentucky.—My regret on seeing them in the Harbinger was moderated only by their exceeding grossness—believing that none of my acquaintance could imagine me capable of approving such an outrage against many of the most exemplary Christians in the land. A. C.

THE TRIUMPH OF TRUTH.

BY JOSHUA MARSDEN.

'Tis built on a rock, and the tempest may rave;
Its solid foundation repels the proud wave;
Though Satan himself should appear in the van,
Its smiles at the rage of the infidel clan.

Like the sun going forth in his mighty career,
To gladden the earth and illumine each sphere;
The chariot of truth shall in majesty roll
O'er climate, isle, ocean, to each distant pole.

A glorified course it shall nobly pursue,
Encircling with radiance both Gentile and Jew;
And millions of heathens, their idols despising,
Shall bask in the light, and exult in its rising!

The shadows that cover the regions of Ham
Shall vanish, or flame with the light of the Lamb;
Each lovely green island that gems the salt wave,
His truth will convert, his philanthropy save!

Already a glory has flamed in the West;
Poor Negroes with spiritual freedom are blest:
The palms of the South show its beautiful blaze,
And the Boreal pines have been tipt with its blaze.

A voice in the desert, a voice in the wood!
A voice o'er the mountain and billowy flood!
"Thy glory is come;" abject heathen, "arise,
And shine" like a new-risen star in the skies!

"A Star in the East" is to millions display'd,
Whose lustre has sunk the proud Crescent in shade;
O'er the darkness of nations, for ages forlorn,
Bright Truth is diffusing millennial morn!

O'er Pagod and altar the gospel has blazed;
The Brahmin has wondered, the Moslem has gaz'd;
The vision delightful shall Salem behold;
And, under one Shepherd, the world be one fold!

The sign of the Cross has appear'd—the blest sign;
And Faith has deciphered the motto divine,
"He must reign" till the nations in homage bow down;
The wicked his footstool—believers his crown.

Life's river of crystal shall every where flow,
Till floweriess deserts a paradise grow;
And wilds bleak and barren burst out in the glory
Predicted by seers in prophetical story.

The Record denounces that Babel shall fall;
Priest, pagod, fane, idol, mosque, minaret—all
The strong holds of Satan to ruins be hurl'd,
And glory shall cover our desolate world!

The mighty may fight with Jehovah's decree,
And sceptic may write that it never shall be;
But the finger of time on its dial shall stop,
Ere one promise prove false, or one prophecy drop!

Go, stop it, proud scorners! Alas! it is vain!
You may as well tie up the winds with a chain;
Or the stars, or the tides of the ocean control;
Or fuse the vast ices that rivet the pole!

The *Christian Messenger*, edited for ten years by Elder Barton W. Stone, will shortly re appear in a larger form. Agents and patrons of the work are requested to send on the names of subscribers immediately to Elder Thomas M. Allen, Columbia, Mo., where the work will be published. It will be conducted, as formerly, by B. W. Stone. It is hoped that letters may come to us free from postage.

December 18, 1839.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER,

NEW SERIES.

VOLUME IV.——NUMBER III.

BETHANY, VA. *MARCH*, 1840.

MORALITY OF CHRISTIANS—*No. XVIII.*

"Masters, render unto your servants that which is just and equal, knowing that you also have a Master in heaven."

WHAT a confusion of speech and of effort has seized and distracted the builders of the mystic tower of modern Babelism, the true antitype of that Babel once erected on the plains of Shinar! They pull in all directions—with, for, and against one another. There are the Masons and the Anti-Masons—the Peace and the War spirits—the Temperance, the Abstinence, and the Indulgence—Missionary and Anti-Missionary—The Abolitionist, Colonizationist, and Proslavery—Democrat, Republican, Federalist—Old School and New School—of all creeds and parties religious and political.

In the midst of this din, confusion, and strife, the primitive disciple of Christ is often perplexed to find answers to the countless questions and difficulties thrown in his way by the jarring agitators and leaders of the people. And still worse, some of the plainest and most important principles and precepts of the Christian system are proscribed, or declared contraband, by some one or other of the diversified belligerents in the field of competition: so that those who belong to none of these parties are frequently inhibited by one or other of them from quoting certain texts, from using certain precepts, lest they should be enrolled amongst its friends or ranked amongst its enemies.

Even our good and pious Editors of the Christian Index, all three—William Brantly, D. D., while in Philadelphia, and its present co-editors, have, in order to put me down, insinuated (for they dare do no more) that there was abolitionism in the Harbinger, and that it might be dangerous to Southern institutions. This was, no longer

ago than last year, sought to be impressed upon the Baptist community of Georgia and the South by the Christian Index! I have, indeed, heard worse than this; but will not at this time divulge it.

In this day one who belongs to Christ's party alone can scarcely make a speech, or write an essay, but some of these partizans will own or disown him, commend or calumniate him, as for or against them, though he may not in the whole effort once have thought of them. What, then, is to be done? Quote no passage of scripture—avoid all those precepts which, because of their direct bearing upon some of these parties, may be perverted into a co-partnery with, or opposition to them. This would, indeed, require a very elastic and compromising sort of conscience—incompatible with the character of one professing to believe that there is one supreme Lawgiver who is able to save and to destroy.

The text that stands at the head of this article is one that has been long and deeply impressed upon my mind, as of great practical utility and importance at all times in this country, and more especially at the present crisis. I have, by the press of other matters on hand, and also on account of the morbid or excited state of feeling in the present paroxism, on every question connected with the subject of Master and Servant, both at the South and at the North, deferred it to this moment.

The extremes, indeed, into which parties at the North and the South have pushed these matters, have not only almost interrupted the current of benevolent feeling amongst Christians, but have made this and similar portions of scripture either a dead or an unmeaning letter; and complaints are being often communicated to us that public ministering brethren, in passing from one state to another, are by brethren viewed with a suspicion and jealousy wholly irreconcilable with Christian candor, good feeling, and cordial co-operation.

Northern abolitionist politicians speak of southern slaveholders as tyrants, robbers, man-stealers, oppressors, &c. &c.; while they of the South return these compliments by calling the abolitionists intermeddling fanatics, madmen, political incendiaries, covenant-breakers, insurrectionists, &c. &c. For my part, if I may be allowed to express an opinion on the subject, having travelled extensively both in the South and in the North, I must say, that however true these compliments may be of certain individuals of both parties, they are very far from being true of Christian communities of my acquaintance, who happen to stand on the opposite sides of this great moral and political question. Men equally distinguished for talents, learning, general intelligence, good morals, Christian character, and elevated standing, are found on both sides of this controversy, as on many others.

But, as *Christians*, we have nothing to do with political or adventitious excitements. I feel upon this subject as I have felt for many years. Always suspicious of great excitements on any subject, I stand aloof from all partizan affinities or antipathies on such matters.—Neither the abolition nor anti-abolition arguments, movements, or excitements have materially changed a single view or sentiment of mine on the subject of American slavery. I always regarded it as a great evil, as a great misfortune to the American family, and have always cherished the pleasing anticipation that a day was rapidly advancing on which, with the consent of all parties, by an inclined plane, or a gradual approximation, the difficulty would be met and overcome, and this otherwise safe and happy Republic saved from shipwreck and ruin on this ominous and tremendous rock.

But I may be mistaken. If, however, all Christian masters would obey this divine precept, I am confident all things in the North and in the South would work together for the good of all parties; and therefore I specially invite the attention of our Christian brethren to the consideration and obedience of this great and royal commandment.

I will only farther premise, that as extremes always beget extremes, I fear the logic and the declamation of all enthusiasts on all questions political, moral, religious, and have to regret those rash and ultra dogmas propounded all over this land in the heat of this controversy, viz.—that "*the holding a person as a slave (or in a state of involuntary servitude) is always a sin.*" From this follows the capital doctrine of *immediate emancipation* as its legitimate consequence; for if it be a sin in every case to hold a slave, it is the duty of all Christians instantly to repent of it and abandon it. Had the Apostles viewed the subject in this light, we never would have met with the command, "Masters, render to your servants that which is just and equal." It would have read, 'Masters, immediately emancipate your slaves, and pay them wages, or let them go and seek employment elsewhere.' And to take the ground of some Christian abolitionists and affirm that these masters were not slaveholders, and these servants not slaves, in the popular acceptation of these words, is at once to shake the foundations of all interpretation, and make both Old Testament and New of non-effect, because wholly unintelligible. For if there were not slaves and slaveholders in the Patriarchal, Jewish, and Christian communities, there never were slaves nor slaveholders in Egypt, Greece, Rome, or America.

But I know it is affirmed that American slaveholding is a very different thing from Egyptian, Grecian, Roman slaveholding. It is, however, to say the least, no worse. But again, American slavehold-

ing is said to be worse, a great deal worse than Patriarchal, Jewish, or Christian slaveholding. Unless Christians do what Paul commanded —that is, 'Render to their servants that which is just and equal,' it is unquestionably much worse. But in justice, (*and a person that cannot hear both sides, and do justice to both sides, is unworthy to be heard on any question*)—I say, in justice to American Christian slaveholders, it must be affirmed that they are not obliged to treat their slaves as the statute books may allow: for in that case they could not, indeed, obey the command, "Render to your slaves that which is just and equal." A man would neither be a Christian husband nor a Christian father, who would treat his wife and children as our statute books may permit him. There is no law that would either fine or imprison a husband if he made his wife and children live on bread and water; there is no law that would punish a father for always refusing marriage to his son or daughter, &c. So there are many things that the laws will permit slaveholders to do, that Christian masters cannot do. The laws will authorize a master to sell a wife from the bosom of her husband, and an infant from the breast of its mother; and does any one believe that a follower of Jesus Christ could do such a deed! He that made Death give back an only son to a bereaved mother, would he allow one of his brethren to rend one of the strongest laws of natural affection, and sell a weeping wife from the embraces of a fond husband, into a foreign land! He that would not send to their homes a hungry audience lest they should faint by the way, would he allow one of his followers to overwork or underfeed one for whom he died! He that opened a blind man's eyes that he might see the sun, would he allow his followers to keep in darkness the intellectual eyes of their fellow-creatures that they should not see the face of the Sun of Righteousness! Or could he that took up babes in his arms and blessed them, bless those masters who tear infants from their mothers' arms for love of gold, and send them into lands of darkness and eternal degradation!

Now our slave laws may allow, for aught I know to the contrary, not only these, but worse deeds than these; but what Christian man will be punished by our laws if he does not do these things! He is not compelled by law to do any of them, any more than he is not compelled to defraud his wife or children of any comfort which he has in his power to bestow.

I intend no legal nor political discussion of this question, but in answer to those abolitionists who make slaveholding in the abstract—that is, without regard to the laws enacted on the subject, always and in every case a sin; and yet justify themselves by the alleged inhumanity and barbarity of certain American laws upon that subject; I

wish to show that the apostolic precept is necessary, and may be obeyed, even in these United States.

These preliminary matters so far arranged and explained, I hasten to the exposition and enforcement of the duty enjoined. And in the first place:—

Some have sought to find a meaning for *master* and *servant* other than what we call a *slaveholder* and *slave:* such as, 'Mechanics, render to your apprentices what is just;' or, 'Employers, render to your hired hands their wages.' But this is wholly forced, unnatural, and contrary to the obvious construction of the original. The two strongest words in the Greek language are used by the Apostle in defining this relation. He uses the words *kurios* and *despotes*—"Lords and despots, render to your slaves what is just and equal." "And you, *slaves*, that have believing *despots*, do not despise them, because they are your brethren; but rather do them service," &c. "Again, are you called, being a slave? Care not for it: but if you can be made *free*, use it rather." It looks to me like proving that the moon is not the sun, nor the sun the moon, to prove that *master* and *servant* in these passages do not mean what they now denote in Virginia. Indeed, the very words "*just* and *equal*" clearly define master and servant in this passage. These show that it was in the head, conscience, and bosom of the master to decide justice and equity in this case, and not in any bargain made between equals. In that case it would have been, 'Masters, pay your servants their wages according to contract.' But here it is left to the master to decide what is just and equal, and that as he must answer for it to the Lord and Despot of Despots.

In the next place, observe that masters could not render that which is just and equal to servants, unless they had them. This is clearly impossible, and proves that the *relation* did exist in the primitive church, and is not in itself a sin.

For were the relation a sin, Paul could not have commanded them, while living in sin, to render justice and equity to those whom they sinfully held in bondage. He would have said, 'Let all masters on entering the Christian church emancipate their slaves, and put an end to the unholy relation.'

To define what justice and equity always should be in all cases, was impossible to Paul, and it is as impossible to us. That must always depend on circumstances. What is just and equal may, however, generally be estimated without much difficulty at any given time and place. The price and profits of labor—the means of subsistence—food, clothing, lodging, medicine, attendance, must all be taken into the account; and on a fair and conscientious consideration of all these,

must be the remuneration. This, with the assistance of the golden rule, will generally lead to a righteous decision; and as the Apostle reminded masters that there was an impartial *Master for life* over them, they must, with a solemn reference to his will, act in this case; for, "with what measure they mete it shall be meted to them again."

Servants who have believing masters, are, because of their equality in the kingdom of Christ with their masters, not on that account to be either uncourteous or disobedient to them; but because they are brethren who partake of the benefit of their labor, they are the more cheerfully to serve them. So ordains Paul. In the church, indeed, there is "neither bond nor free"—all are servants of Christ, and equal there; but not so in the State: there they are masters and servants, and the relation must be respected for the good of both parties.

Now if all Christian masters were faithfully to discharge these duties to their servants, and be at all pains to preach and teach Christ to them, to enlighten their understandings in the things of God and Christ and eternal life; and thus make a clear and broad line of difference between them and those that are not Christians, the condition of our African population, instead of exciting the *pity*, would soon stir up the *envy* of a multitude who are now denouncing in unmeasured terms the horrors of southern slavery.

The South has said much on the patriarchal character of this institution. It was, indeed, in Abraham's time a very happy institution; and it is to be hoped that it will yet become so in the South. Abraham's slaves, to the amount of three hundred and eighteen, at one time took up arms for their master, and vanquished kings for his sake. Surely Christian slaves should be as much attached to their Christian masters as were the slaves of Abraham and other ancient and venerable slaveholders. Among God's people all insurrections were in defence of their masters; and if Christians do their duty now, it will be so whenever necessary for their defence against an invading foe.

True, indeed, many Christians at the South are very sensitive about the hands into which their slaves may fall after their demise, and considerable difficulties arise in their minds for their future destiny; of which I may speak more fully at some future time.—Meantime I will only add, that besides the duty of the churches to see that the laws of Christ touching masters and servants be obeyed both by Christian masters and Christian servants, as *citizens of the state* they have a vote. When, then, any of the laws governing this institution, are, in their judgment, cruel, unjust, unrepublican, and unchristian, they have at the polls, in their citizen character, a right and a duty

to seek for their amendment or abrogation. This, in my judgment, not only now, but in all my editorial life, as may be learned from No. 1. Christian Baptist, to the present day, is all that is incumbent upon our brethren living under such an institution. I will farther state, *as my opinion*, that if the professors of Christ's religion and morality at the South, were to obey the laws of Old and New Testaments, *as masters*, nine-tenths of all abolitionists would hold their peace, and leave to future developments and emergencies the fortunes of this unfortunate institution. A. C

SPECIMENS OF SOPHISTRY—*No. I.*

Some men have a peculiar vein of sophistry in their constitution or mental organization, which is constantly betraying them into both theoretic and practical errors, fatal to their prosperity in science, religion, morality, and worldly prudence. I have found instances of this sort amongst what are usually called honest well-meaning persons, as well as amongst those of a doubtful, and even contrary character. With some it is, indeed, a moral malady; with others, a natural defect, or the result of an imperfect and erroneous education.

Unfortunately, however, this sophistical turn is very generally, if not universally, associated with the highest self-confidence in the sanity as well as the honesty of the unfortunate subject of it. None more sanguine, confident, and dogmatical in their assertions, than those very persons whose conclusions ought to be received with the utmost caution and scrupulosity.

In abstract science, in speculative theology, and in the theory of government, such reasoners have often figured for a long time without detection, or successful refutation. But in economics and mechanics, and sometimes in politics, their false reasonings are more easily detected. The anarchy, misrule, and untold barbarities of the reign of terror in France, was the best comment on the theory of Voltaire, Diderot, Baron d'Holbach, d'Alembert, Condillac, &c. &c. The bankruptcies of an immense host of traffickers, speculators, and manufacturers, as well as the abortions of a thousand and one inventors of perpetual motions, and such like labor-saving machines, fully expose the intellectual frailties and sophistical reasonings of a multitude of sophisters, who, but for the infallible verdicts of experiment and practical proof, had been enrolled amongst the great, and wise, and learned of the human race.

In no department has the world been more fatally cursed with the labors of this class of philosophists, than in the most important of all others—that of religion and morality. And the reason is, religious speculations are beyond the reach of experiment, at least of such experiment and proof as is accessible to the class who are most easily duped by such delusive theories. They are not susceptible of mathematical demonstration, nor of experimental proof, sensible and intelligible to all who reason on the subject. It is, indeed, worthy of remark, that as we judge of a tree by its fruits, so may we judge of theories of religion by the behaviour of those who profess them. Still, as many things pass for Christian virtues that are but splendid sins, and many things are condemned as defects in piety which are its greatest excellence, the multitude untaught and uneducated in the scriptures of truth are incompetent judges in the case, and approve and condemn theories by the errors and prejudices of their own education.

The ground assumed by the most rational reformers is itself not an infallible safeguard against the extravagance and folly to which we allude. If speculative theology, air-built, visionary, and ideal, be wholly proscribed from our attention and respect, that mood of mind, that sophistical proneness to false reasoning to which we allude, will find a vent for itself on the very text of the Book of Life, or in some attachment to its own views of congruity and decorum, to support which it will levy a heavy conscription on its own resources of ingenious distortions, assumptions, analogies, and hypotheses, rather than make common sense and the common rules of interpretation the guide of its reasonings and researches.

This frailty of genius and of those who would be thought to possess it; this love of paradox, of new ideas, and this fondness for their own opinions, as it displays itself in those philosophists who come within our supervision, ought to be fully exposed; and, therefore, I purpose occasionally to give specimens of sophistry and false reasoning even among any of our brethren, as well as strangers who may happen to furnish good examples of the various categories which I now have in my eye. I shall not, however, call any names, lest I should give offence; and as my efforts are benevolently intended to furnish tests of sound criticism, and rules of right interpretation, as well as to disabuse minds that have been disturbed with false reasonings, I trust my labors in this corner of the Harbinger, will be as well received as they are well intended.

I shall not be absolutely governed either by a natural or an artificial method; but as principles may occur, or illustrations offer themselves, and as the exigencies may require, shall propound such rules and give such examples as may suit my designs—leaving the classification of them to a more convenient season.

I shall, therefore, first of all lay down some principles that the oracles of logic, as well as the dictates of common sense, equally sanction in the detection and exposition of the errors of any antagonist system. As much of this work has fallen in our way, and must always obtrude itself upon those who attempt to bring men back to first principles, to reason and truth, it is the more expedient at this crisis that we have the correct principles of maintaining truth and of exposing error more fully stated; and then such aberrations from them as are most common, set forth as examples of the necessity of understanding the rules and of applying them correctly. And first with regard to our opponents.

Rule I. When we assail any dogma which is worthy of being assailed, it is all-important and essential to the validity and force of our reasonings that we use the terms of the dogma in the sense which he affixes to them, and in no other sense; otherwise all our labor will be lost. For example, does any one argue for a creed as essential to the purity of the church? The essential terms in this dogma are *creed*, *purity*, and *church*. These we must understand as he does. A *creed*, with him, means *a written abstract of certain Bible doctrines, made by uninspired men, and solemnly subscribed by the parties*. *Purity*, in the dogma, means neither morals nor piety, but *orthodoxy*. *Church*,, with him, means the tenth party of Presbyterians.

Now if an issue be formed on this dogma, we must draw out the proposition as thus defined in all our attempts to refute it. We must, indeed, read it as follows;—'*A written abstract of certain Bible doctrines, made by uninspired men, and solemnly subscribed by every candidate, is essential to the orthodoxy of the tenth party of Presbyterians.*' In supporting and in assailing this dogma, any argument or objection not founded in this acceptation of the terms, is a downright sophism—a palpable delusion. Should the defendant argue that the primitive church had a creed because they had the writings of the Apostles, or the Apostles themselves to explain their views, this would prove nothing, because not in the definitions of his creed. It might be all true that the primitive church had the writings of the Apostles and themselves to interpret them; and yet it supports not the creed for which he pleads. Nor will it do to argue that every church of Christ must have its own views of the Bible in the hearts of its members. All this may be, and the dogma nevertheless false.

Or should he argue that no party has ever been long pure and peaceable without his creed as defined by himself, it avows nothing unless *orthodoxy* means *pure and peaceable*, and woful experience proves that orthodoxy is not often either pure or peaceable. Finally, should he ever argue and prove that such a creed and such orthodoxy as he has

avowed in his dogma are necessary to the church of Christ, it will not follow that such are essential to the tenth party of Presbyterians, unless that be first proved to be identical with the church of Christ.

Again, his assailant need not show that creeds do not make men pure in morals, nor exemplary in piety: for that is not identical with orthodoxy, and consequently reaches not the dogma in debate. Nor need he show that such creeds are incompatible with the constitution of Christ's church; for that may be proved, and still it will not follow that they are incompatible with the constitution of the tenth party of Presbyterians.

We shall state another example of false reasoning under this rule. A denies the immortality of the soul, because eternal life is conditional. Now the argument rests upon the acceptation of the words *immortality* and *eternal life*. Are they synonymous terms? If they be not, the conditionality of eternal life or any other attribute or circumstance of eternal life, neither proves nor disproves any thing about the immortality of the soul. By the immortality of the soul B means no more than its perpetual existence, without regard to happiness or misery. But does eternal life mean no more than simple existence, without regard to happiness or misery? Most assuredly it means more: therefore, it is a complete sophism to attempt to disprove the immortality of the soul by any attribute of eternal life, or affirmation concerning it.

A. C.

CHRISTIANS AMONG THE SECTS—*No. X.*

POSITIVE ORDINANCES—CIRCUMCISION.

This institution has been *peculiarly* regarded as "*a mere external rite.*" But upon a closer examination it will be perceived that even this institution which was "outward in the flesh," was eminently adapted to produce a *moral* impression. How forcible the impression it was calculated to make upon that people, that they were "cut off from the world"—from its idolatries and pollutions! "Lo! the people shall dwell alone," says the magic seer of Pethor,

But I must hasten over the ground, as I perceive that numbers are waiting impatiently to see where Christianos will end. I trust that the reader will be led to believe (if he does not now believe) that the Lord never gave to man "*a mere external ordinance.*" No, indeed! They are all full of moral meaning! They are "for our sakes"—for the sake of the heart—the affections! It has been abundantly shown

that when those ordinances have failed to produce moral effects, they have then become an abomination to the Lord "He is not a Jew, who is one outwardly; neither is circumcision that which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew, who is one inwardly; and circumcision is of the heart, and not of the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God." But we will next consider

THE FEAST OF THE PASSOVER.

Surely we cannot conceive of an institution better calculated to make a *moral impression*. Every thing connected with this ordinance was calculated to call to the minds of that people the momentous realities of that awful night, when "the angel of death spread his wings on the blast"—when the glory and the strength of Egypt were laid low in the dust in a moment of time. But, "happy art thou, O Israel! O people saved by the Lord!" With their slaughtered victims in their houses, prepared for the *feast*, and the blood of the lamb sprinkled upon the posts and lintels of their house, they are safe in the promises of Jehovah. Then the manner of the celebration, how admirably calculated to impress upon their minds the perils and the haste of their flight! Their loins girded—their sandals on their feet—their staves in their hands—every thing ready for flight. And then the *bitter herbs* with which the feast was to be eaten, how impressive! how calculated to recall the remembrance of that *bitter* and cruel bondage which they suffered in that "furnace of affliction"—"the land of Egypt"—"the house of bondage"

THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES.

How admirably was it calculated to bring to mind the toils and *privations* of that wearisome sojourn in the wilderness—to humble them under a sense of their rebellions, their murmurings and unbelief—to humble them under a sense of both "the goodness and severity of God"—his goodness in guiding them through "that great and terrible wilderness," feeding them with "corn from heaven," giving them angels' food—taking them and "carrying all the days of old," "as the eagle taketh her young ones and beareth them on her wings" to a place of safety and delight—"leading them as a horse through the wilderness"—his justice and severity in destroying the transgressors. All these recollections were awakened in the minds of the people of Israel while they dwelt in booths made of "the boughs of goodly trees, branches of palm trees, and the boughs of thick trees, and willows of the brook." But when autumn had poured its golden treasures—its "horn of plenty" into the lap of the grateful tribes, how joyful an occasion was

THE FEAST OF THE FIRST FRUITS, OR INGATHERINGS.

Joy and gladness were to possess every heart, and praise and thanksgiving to employ every tongue during these "holy convocations"—these "solemn fasts."

The *moral* and devotional effects of these three great annual festivals, when rightly observed, can scarcely be estimated. They were calculated pre-eminently to make the nation feel that they were *brethren!* Pre-eminently were they calculated to promote sociality, *benevolence*, sympathy, and all the social virtues; to assimilate and soften character and manners; but above all, and beyond all, to cause the tribute of a nation's gratitude to ascend to "the Giver of all good"—to the "Preserver of men."

How beautifully does David, "the sweet singer of Israel," set forth the ecstacy of the pious Jews of his time, as they prepared throughout all their tribes to go up to the city of Zion, the place which the Lord had chosen to set his name there. In the one hundred and twenty-second Psalm he thus breaks forth, "I was glad when they said unto me, Let us go into the house of the Lord. Our feet shall stand within thy gates, O Jerusalem." Then as they draw nigh to the city, and especially the youth who have never visited the city, as they view its splendid domes, its costly palaces, its lofty and majestic towers, "its walls and its bulwarks," in admiration they exclaim, "Jerusalem is builded as a city that is compact together, whither the tribes go up, even the tribes of the Lord, to the testimony of Israel, to give thanks unto the name of the Lord: for these are set thrones of judgment, the thrones of the house of David." Then the elders of Israel who stand ministering about the Temple, address the multitude of the admiring worshippers, saying, "Pray for the peace of Jerusalem." The multitude respond, "They shall prosper that love thee. Peace be within thy walls, and prosperity within thy palaces. For my brethren and companions' sakes I will now say, Peace be within thee. Because of the house of the Lord our God, I will seek thy good."

These were the reciprocal salutations and emotions of the *pious* Jews as they came together at these great festivals. The Jewish economy, as a whole, was superlatively calculated to make that people social, sympathizing, and benevolent. But in the apostacy of the nation the design and tendency of their positive institutions were lost sight of; when, instead of the sympathy and benevolence taught them in their religion, they came together full of malice and bitterness—of cruelty and injustice—when the Lord "looked for *judgment*, but behold *oppression*—for righteousness, but behold a cry:" then it was that the Most High says to them, "Your new moons and your appointed

fasts my soul hateth; they are a trouble to me; I am weary to bear them. And when you spread forth your hands I will hide mine eyes from you; when you make many prayers I will not hear: your hands are full of blood." "Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil, learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow. Come now, let us reason together, saith the Lord: though your sins were as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be like wool."

CHRISTIANOS.

THOUGHTS ON EVIDENCE—*No. IV.*

Brother Campbell,

I SUPPOSE I need not ask so firm a believer as yourself, whether or not, with the Apostle Paul,* you believe in *witches?* In days of yore this faith was very common; but we have so few lovers of the *antique*, that it has become almost obsolete. Unless, indeed, the spirit of witchcraft has been *modernized* like every thing else; and is now, by means of some subtle metempsychosis, animating, like modern faith, a different form, so that we are still *unconsciously* familiar with it. We live, however, at a period when the *idealities* of a former age have become our *realities;* and its *realities* our *idealities*. Thus the ignorance of the ancients has now come to be our knowledge, and their knowledge our ignorance. Such is the effect of revolution in every thing. We exchange winter for summer with our Antœci; while the night of our Antipodes become in turn our day; and their day, our night.

This is the age of *clairvoyance*. We have come into the world at a time when the intellectual sun is supposed to have attained the highest altitude, and to be in fact so exactly in the zenith, that, like the people whom geographers call Ascii, we are without shadows: and even Doubt itself, if it ever had a shadow, has one no longer. Judge, then, how hard a task it will be, under such circumstances, to show, as promised in my last, that the senses are not always to be depended upon; that a man may be mistaken in his perceptions, and that our being without shadows may, after all, be owing to our being *in the dark*.

Seriously, however, have you room in the attic story for a few *spectres?* Or, if not, have you space in your voluminous Harbinger for

* Galatians v. 20.

them? Here are a few of a curious and interesting kind, as I think, selected out of many others which I reserve for the present. And I can assure you and your readers that they are all genuine—that they are real matters of fact; a consideration which, I feel confident, will weigh much with you and them, and commend them to the honor I bespeak for them.

Whatever tends to throw any light upon the important subject of evidence is worthy of being noticed and preserved. We should be fully apprised of all the ambuscades which may exist in the avenues of our knowledge and experience. The subject of spectral illusions is therefore one which merits examination. I doubt not it may tend both to explain some modern visions, and to give new force to the ancient apostolic testimony. At all events, it will be interesting to those who love to investigate the operations of that wonderful machine—THE HUMAN MIND.

Dr. Hibbert and Sir Walter Scott have recorded many cases of spectral apparitions which present themselves even at mid-day to persons of sound mind and well regulated imagination. Since their publications appeared, the subject has attracted more attention than formerly, and many new and interesting cases have been noticed. Before detailing them I would remind the reader that an apparition, in the common sense of the term, in which it was twice used by the Apostles, differs from a spectral illusion in this, that the former supposes the object seen to be actually present, while the latter is wholly a deception of the sight, having no real existence whatever.

One of the most singular illusions is that of Nicolai, a bookseller of Berlin, who communicated an account of his own case to the Prussian Academy of Sciences. A translation of his memoir was published in 1803 in an English journal; and, except through the brief abstract of it given by Dr. Hibbert and Sir Walter Scott, is still but little known to the general reader. 'Towards the end of the year 1790 and the beginning of 1791, M. Nicolai had been agitated by various misfortunes, which preyed deeply upon his mind, and the 24th of February an event occurred which threw him into violent distress. About 10 o'clock in the morning, when his wife and a friend had entered his room, for the purpose of consoling him, he suddenly perceived, at the distance of a few paces, the standing figure of a person deceased, which remained from seven to eight minutes, and which the rest of the party were of course unable to see. A little after 4 o'clock in the afternoon the same figure appeared to him when he was alone; and upon his going to mention this to his wife, the spectre accompanied him to her apartment, alternately vanishing and re-appearing. A

little after 6 o'clock, several stalking figures also appeared, but they had no connexion with the figure already mentioned. When his mind had become more composed, and his bodily indisposition had been removed by medical treatment, our bookseller expected that these appearances would take leave of him. His expectations, however, were disappointed, for they increased in number and underwent the most extraordinary transformation.

The standing figure of the person deceased never appeared to him after the 24th of February; but several other figures occupied its place. These figures were chiefly those of persons whom he did not know, though he sometimes saw those of his acquaintances. The figures of persons alive occurred more frequently than those of persons who were deceased, and he distinctly remarked that the acquaintances with whom he daily conversed never appeared to him as phantasms. When, after some weeks he had become familiar with these unbidden guests, he endeavored to conjure up phantasms of his acquaintance, and for this purpose he tried to bring them before his imagination in the most lively manner; but though he had but a short time before seen them as phantasms, he never could by this process, succeed in giving them an external locality.

While he was conversing with his physicians and his wife concerning the phantasms which hovered around him, the figures sometimes left him altogether, and again appeared either singly or in groups. The apparitions were generally human figures of both sexes who, like people at a fair, passed to and fro, as if they had no mutual connexion, although they sometimes appeared to have business with one another. On one or two occasions he saw persons on horseback dogs and birds, all of which appeared in their natural size and of the same colors which they exhibited in real life, though somewhat paler.

When these apparitions began to be seen more frequently, Nicolai began also to hear them speak; sometimes they addressed one another, but generally they spoke to himself, in short speeches, which contained nothing disagreeable. This loquacity in the apparitions occurred most frequently when he was alone, though he sometimes heard it in society, intermixed with the actual conversation of the company.

Although these appearances had ceased to excite any disagreeable emotion, and had even afforded him frequent subjects of amusement and mirth; yet, as his disorder had sensibly increased, and as the figures had appeared to him for whole days together, and even when he awoke during the night, he found it necessary not only to take medicine, but to apply leeches. This was done on the 20th of April, at 11 o'clock in the forenoon, and during the operation, when he was.

sitting alone with the surgeon, the room swarmed with human forms of every description, which crowded fast upon one another till half past 4 o'clock. The figures then began to move more slowly, their colors became gradually paler, and, after intervals of seven minutes, he could distinguish a palpable diminution in their intensity without any change in the distinctness of their figures. At about half past 6 o'clock they became entirely white, and moved very slightly: their forms, however, were still perfectly distinct; and, without decreasing in number, they gradually became less perceptible. Instead of moving off or vanishing, as they had usually done, they now dissolved immediately into air; whole pieces of them continuing for a length of time, and at last disappearing. About 8 o'clock not a vestige of them remained, and Nicolai was never again disturbed by these spectral illusions.

Accustomed to the investigation of mental phenomena, Nicolai took a great interest in studying the facts which had thus occurred to himself, and he has recorded various excellent observations, of which the following are the most interesting to the Pneumatologist.

1st. He endeavored to discover if the figures were presented to his mind by some association with his previous thoughts; but, though he sometimes thought that he discovered some such association, especially during the latter period of his visions, yet he assures us, that on the whole, he could trace no connexion between the figures and the state of his mind, or the nature of his employments, or the other thoughts which occupied his attention. 2d. He found that he could always distinguish phantoms from real figures, and he never once erred in making this distinction. 'I knew, extremely well,' says he, 'when it only appeared to me that the door was opened and the phantasms entered, and the door really was opened and some person came in.' 3d. The appearance of the phantoms was, in every case, involuntary, and depended little, if at all, upon external circumstances. They were equally distinct whether he was alone or in society, whether he was in broad day light or in darkness, whether he was in his own house or in that of a neighbor. He noticed, however, that they were less frequent in another person's house than in his own, and they very seldom appeared when he walked the public streets. 4th. The figures sometimes disappeared when he shut his eyes, and sometimes they remained; when they vanished in the former case, nearly the same figures appeared when his eyes again opened. 5th. The figures were neither terrible, ludicrous, nor repulsive, and they appeared oftener in motion than at rest. 6th. On two or three occasions, after he had ceased to observe these appearances, he felt a propensity to see them, or a sensation as if he saw something which in a moment was again

gone. This sensation he experienced after an interval of eight years, when he was drawing up his memoir on the subject, for the Academy of Sciences at Berlin.'

Such, in substance, is the accurate and interesting account given of this singular case. Such phenomena were formerly regarded as the indications, or at least the effects, of mental aberration; but a more perfect acquaintance with them enables us to give a more rational and satisfactory solution of them. This we will give after we have presented some other cases, and in the meantime would only observe in general that there was here evidently a morbid excitement of the perceptive faculties, by which they were kept in a state of preternatural activity. As this increased, the functions of the ear even became affected as well as those of the eye, and he could hear the phantasms speak. The effect of the application of leeches very conclusively shows the nature of the affection; for whenever that fullness of the vessels by which the excitement was perpetuated, was removed, the figures disappeared, some pieces of them remaining for a longer time than others, denoting that certain points in the delicate organs of perception were more deeply affected than others.

Though perhaps foreign to our subject, it is worthy of remark also that this case affords a fine illustration of the doctrine that different parts of the brain discharge different and peculiar functions. It will be at once perceived that while the perceptive powers were thus singularly affected, the powers of reflection and judgment continued undisturbed. *Color*, *individuality*, and more particularly *form*, to use the terms of phrenology, appear to have been the chief seats of the affection in Nicolai's case. When occupied with the observation of new objects, as when walking the streets, or in a strange house, this morbid activity appears to have been for a time diverted. But when these faculties were not thus engaged, as when he was alone or in his own house where every thing was familiar to him, the phantoms were more numerous.

It is worthy of attention too, that although these faculties were thus affected, they were at the same time capable of a healthy or correct action. His perception of external objects was perfect, and he could even at once distinguish a phantom from a real person. The morbid action, then, upon which these phantasms depended, was evidently of a subdued or secondary character, yielding to the stronger and more natural action excited by external objects. This peculiarity clearly distinguishes such cases from those of mental aberration in which persons either perceive correctly, but reason wrongly; or reason correctly from false perceptions. R. R.

PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE.

The following correspondence never was intended for the public eye. The parties are an excellent brother yet living, and an amiable and most exemplary young lady—a disciple indeed, who is now with the Lord. I have seldom known a young lady in the prime of life, of family and fortune, whose faith achieved a more decided victory over the world in its most fascinating and bewitching forms, than did that of this truly excellent and lovely sister whose memory will be long embalmed in the admiration of those who had the happiness to know her

Presuming that the correspondence will be of some service to those who have a taste for undissembled piety, and for such displays of Christian sentiment and feeling as are natural, simple, and unaffected, I have obtained license to publish it. A. C.

P——, December 12, 1837.

Beloved in the Lord,

I embrace this early opportunity of addressing a few lines to you. I reached home on Friday the 8th, at sunset, and found my family all comfortable; for which I thank "the preserver of men." Our little daughter, during my absence, had been "sick nigh to death:" her life was despaired of for several days. She now exhibits every symptom of returning health. We look upon her as given a second time to us. O! may she be blessed, and made a blessing! The only solicitude I feel for my children is, that they may be trained for the skies. I would rather see them commencing life in the fear of the Lord, with minds richly fraught with the treasures of heavenly grace and knowledge, than to see them upon thrones——did I say? The comparison is low and mean. Say rather, with the wise man, that "all the things that are to be desired, are not to be *compared* with it." The only rational object of life is to form a character for eternity; which all are most certainly *doing*, even those who say, "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." *Time*, with all its cares and ills, is, in amount, *eternity* to us! Or, as another has said, "Time is the seed-time of eternity." Life is, then, an unspeakable *blessing*, if it "serve as a passage to heaven." but it is an unutterable *curse*, if it only fit us for "the blackness of darkness forever." Health. and reason, and intellect are inestimable gifts, when consecrated to "Him who died for us and rose again." Wealth and influence in society are precious favors when employed in reclaiming the wandering, enlightening the benighted, instructing the ignorant, giving "eyes to the blind and feet to the lame," as in the language of Job; or as in the words of our Lord, "in making to ourselves friends with the mammon of unrighteousness;" which good works go before us as a letter of introduction—a passport to "the eternal mansions;" but how great a *judgment* when they only furnish us with the means of personal gratification, and of living like the "rich man" in the parable, "in jovial splendor every day." They, then, afford a more genteel, but at the same time more speedy conveyance to the gates of perdition. I have no delight in any society but that of "the pure in heart," "whose delight is in the law of the Lord," and I thank the Father of mercies that I often enjoy such society, and have my spirits refreshed while passing through this "wilderness of sin." But if it be happiness to enjoy the society of a *few* of the "pure in heart" *here*, while many of

of our dearest friends are away from us—while laboring under the pressure of so many corporeal evils—while away from "the presence of God"—while in all things "we see as through a glass darkly." If, with all these privations, we can enjoy "glory begun below," and partake of "celestial fruits on earthly ground," what will be our bliss when we shall join all our friends that have gone before us in the "faith of Jesus"—when we shall unite with all the "pure in heart"—when,

"From sorrow, toil, and pain,
And sin, we shall be free;"

when we shall be admitted to the "presence of the Lord, where is fulness of joy; and to his right hand, "where are pleasures for evermore." There will be Abraham, "the father of the faithful;" and "Sarah, the mother of us all"—there will be Enoch and Elijah, who remained pure amidst universal corruption—there will be Noah, Daniel, and Job—David, and all the divine poets—Isaiah, and all the Prophets—there will be the "three worthies," "who through faith quenched the violence of fire;" and all the ancient saints, who were stoned, who were sawn asunder, who wandered about in caves and dens of the earth; of whom the world was not worthy"—there will be the "Twelve Apostles of the Lamb," whose names are written on the resplendent walls of the heavenly Jerusalem—there will be the Maries who followed our Lord, and ministered to him and soothed his sorrows, while he sojourned among us "full of grace and truth"—there will be "the myriads of angels"—

"There reigns the Father of our Lord,
In light effulgent dwelling;"

there is "Jesus the mediator of the new covenant,"

"In whom all the fulness of God
Forever transcendantly shines;"

And, O! there will be all "who have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." And surely eternity itself will be none too long to sing the praises of Him that hath "loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests to God." For these glorious things let us *strive*—let us watch and pray.

With fervent desires for your *present* and eternal happiness, I am your brother in the hope of eternal life. M. S. C.

W——, January 3, 1838.

Dear Sir—Your welcome letter was received nearly two weeks since,, and I hasten to improve the earliest opportunity of answering it. We were truly glad to hear of your safe return to your dear family.

The meeting lasted several days after you left W——, and continued to be very interesting. Several were immersed, among whom was a member of a Presbyterian church, from Connecticut.

Perhaps you may not consider a few words with regard to my state of mind at this time altogether uninteresting. I can assure you, dear sir, that the "mist on the mountains" has not only disappeared on a nearer approach to it, but a most delightful sunshine has taken its

place. For some months I had been a stranger to that religious enjoyment which I once possessed, (small though it was.) I felt distressed with doubts in regard to my baptism; and though at times I endeavored to drive away these thoughts, I could not succeed. I was restrained by a characteristic diffidence from telling my doubts even to my mother. I was highly gratified, however, when you introduced the subject yourself the evening before you left—an evening I shall remember as long as memory remains with me. I feared that, instead of putting an end to the conflict in my mind, I should only go still farther into the labyrinths of doubt and confusion, to which I could see no end. But now, in the consciousness of having done my duty, I am happy, and the gracious heavenly Father has indeed fulfilled his promises to me. I have that joy and peace in believing that I never had before; and I regard it as my *greatest privilege*, as well as my highest duty, to seek to *know* and *do* all the will of my Father in heaven. Every doubt that formerly proved so fatal to my peace of mind is forever silenced. "Bless the Lord, O my soul, and all that is within me bless his holy name. Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all his benefits; who forgiveth all thine iniquitles; who healeth all thy diseases"

My dear mother unites with me in Christian love to yourself and your dear wife, whom we love though we have not seen. It will give us great pleasure to hear from you as often as you can make it convenient to write to us.

Yours in Christ Jesus,

S. H. K.

W—— M——, Feb. 1838.

Dear sister S.—Your letter of January came duly to hand, for which accept my thanks. It was, to me, full of interest.

We are all in pretty good health, thanks to our Father in heaven.

You apologize for filling so much of your letter with an account of yourself; but your letter would have been a blank without it. You might have filled your pages with the most important events *merely temporal*, and they would have been regarded by me with comparative indifference; but to know that you are enjoying "the favor of God," which is life, and "his loving kindness which is better than life," gives me unspeakable joy. There is nothing truly desirable that does not lead to the enjoyment of God. What is all science compared with that which imparts eternal life—even "to know the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he has sent"? What are all the treasures of the earth, all the bounties of Providence, and all the blessings of society, if "the goodness of God" thus manifested does not "lead us to repentance!" I prize no knowledge that does not lead to the fountain of all being and blessedness. When I hear of the astonishing and unparalleled efforts which are making in Prussia, Russia, and Bavaria, I only rejoice because I hear that with the whole system of education they are blending religion—in every department they are teaching the Bible. Were it otherwise I would say with Dr. Young, "With the talents of an angel a man may be a fool."

I have of late been both thinking and speaking on the subject of

Christian *peculiarity*, or *non-conformity* to the world. The great mass of professing Christians appear to think that there are no rules by which to determine how far it is right to follow the world. But the difficulty consists in not understanding that Christians are to be governed by principle, and not by statute law. "The saints are ruled by love," says the poet; and the Apostle affirms that the law is written on the tables of the heart: so that, as Irving says, "although the law of Christ is a thousand times less specific, yet it applies to a thousand times *more* cases than the laws of man." The law of Christ enters our hearts, and takes cognizance of our motives; hence the interrogation, Why do I thus, or so? will, when honestly applied, always bring us right. Why do we imitate the fashions of the world as much as we do? Is it to please ourselves? Then the law of Christ says, "Let no one seek to please himself; for even Christ pleased not himself." Why do we sometimes make ourselves sociable in company where we can have no enjoyment, and can expect to do no good? Is it to please our friends? Then the law of Christ says, "If I yet please *men*, I am not the servant of Christ." Thus it is that "the word of the Lord is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." In this way we can detect all the sophistry of our deceitful hearts. This method of bringing home inquiry as to motive will forever, with all the doubts and difficulties that young Christian professors often affect to feel with regard to worldly amusements, and what is called innocent recreations. How would they like to be found in the *theatre* or the ball-room "when the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with the voice of the archangel and the tramp of God"? But how would we wish to be found by him at his coming? Would it not be in imitating his divine example—soothing affliction's humble bed—relieving the distressed—feeding the hungry—clothing the naked—reclaiming the wandering—worshipping God—or conversing upon the hope of immortality? Bishop Newton says, "The Christian is neither a cynic nor a stoic; he does not aim at being needlessly singular, or practising self-devised austerities: yet he will be very jealous of any thing that might entangle his affections, damp his zeal, or straiten him in his opportunities of serving his Saviour." And is it not true that Christian females generally expend so much in adorning their own persons and their families, that they have very little left for clothing the naked? Is it not true that so much time is consumed in preparing luxuries for the table, that very little time is left for the reading of the scriptures, for meditation, for prayer, and for visiting the sick and the afflicted? Consider, dear sister, how much you and your dear mother might accomplish in the circle of your acquaintance by firmly setting your faces against these evils. May the Lord give us understanding in all things!

Mrs. C. joins me in much Christian love to yourself and mother. Farewell! Yours in the Lord. M. S. C.

W——, May 3d, 1838.

Dear Sir—Although I have been unavoidably prevented from answering your last for a long time, yet I trust it is not too late to do so now. We have had much illness with us from severe colds—all recovered except my youngest sister C——, who is yet confined to her bed; she is, however, better, and we hope will soon be well.

It is blissful to know at all times that "the Lord reigns," and that he will do right. It seems to me as though that class of people who disbelieve the existence of the God of the Bible, must be the most miserable of all mankind: to see those whom they love on a death-bed, having no power to relieve the suffering body or to comfort the sinking spirit—to see them leave the world thus, without the hope of meeting them hereafter in a better world. Indeed, I cannot conceive of a scene of more intense agony. But to feel that we have been deprived of those we loved by Him "who is too wise to err and too good to be unkind"—to be assured that "all things shall work together for good to those that love God," is calculated to inspire the Christian with the most perfect peace in every time of trial.

The subject of nonconformity to the world is one upon which I have both thought and conversed much. I wish I could say as much of my practice! I think the subject has been fatally neglected by the Christian church. Many contend that we ought to conform, *in some measure*, to the world, else we shall excite their derision; but they seem to find no limitation, and go *all lengths* in worldly conformity. How much more do they in this way, by their inconsistency, incur derision and reproach! And, ah! how many, so far from being "ruled by love," appear to be ruled by *fear* altogether! who *appear* to regard our heavenly Father as a *tyrant* who gives laws merely to test our obedience, regardless whether they tend to our happiness or misery. To escape punishment appears to be the highest aim of such persons. Surely it is not uncharitable to say they cannot know by experience the truth of the Saviour's declaration, "My yoke is easy and my burden is light." Truly, "the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes;" "the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether, and in keeping them there is great reward." It seems to me that the experience of every Christian might be sufficient to teach them the evil of associating with the worldly minded, and joining in their vain and frivolous conversation, when they cannot expect either to confer or to receive good. I know for myself that an evening thus spent leaves an impression on my mind sometimes for days, favorable to *any thing* rather that growth in grace. It is not because I *enjoy* such company. I think I can truly say, I delight only in the society of those with whom I hope to spend an eternity in heaven.

It is with pain I acknowledge that our sex do spend so much time in decorating their frail bodies, to the neglect of the great interests of the soul. There is, alas! but too little difference between women professing godliness and those professing it not. The former appear to spend as much both of *time* and of thought in preparing luxuries for the table and adornings for the person, as the latter. But I am aware that talking and theorizing will be of little avail without *practice*, and it is my daily prayer that I may not be careful to adorn myself externally, but be in the habitual exercise of "pure and undefiled religion," possessing the ornament of great price, "a meek and quiet spirit—"a wonderful pearl of exceeding price, whose virtue shall not decay."

Mother unites with me in Christian love to yourself and wife.

S. H. K.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

FAMILY CULTURE.

CONVERSATIONS AT THE CARLTON HOUSE.

No. III.

The fourth chapter of Genesis being read, Olympas called upon the junior class for the facts in the lesson for the morning. "Tell me," says he, "Susan, how many sons of Adam and Eve are named in this chapter?

Susan. There are three—Cain, Abel, and Seth.

Olympas. We shall leave out Seth for the present, and attend to the history of Cain and Abel. What were the employments of Cain and Abel?

James. Cain was a farmer, and Abel a shepherd.

Olympas. And what, Henry, was the employment of Adam their father?

Henry. He was a gardener.

Olympas. And so the three most ancient callings in the world were gardening, farming, and keeping sheep. Certainly, then, they were simple, innocent, and pleasing employments. But what need was there for pursuing any calling? Was not Adam very rich? How rich was Adam, Susan?

Susan. He had dominion over all the earth, and all the beasts and cattle and fowl. He was as rich as the whole world.

Olympas. And why did he work? Do people, Edward, that are now called very rich, labor at any calling?

Edward. Adam was commanded to dress and keep the garden of Eden, and he most likely commanded his sons to select some business and pursue it.

Olympas. True, he was commanded to dress and preserve the garden as God gave it to him. The reason of this is, there is no happiness in being idle. Indeed, there is no enjoyment but in employment. If we do not look, our eyes afford no pleasure; if we do not listen, our ears cannot charm us; unless we use that wonderfully constructed instrument the hand, we can neither admire nor enjoy it. Goodness, then, ordained that man should work. Every wise and good father will teach his sons and daughters to employ themselves in business, that they may enjoy themselves—that they may be useful and happy. For this reason it is that I am at so much pains to teach my sons agriculture and horticulture; and that your mother employs her daughters in domestic affairs. If king Adam, the richest sovereign that ever lived, made his children labor, who were joint heirs of all the

goods and chattels, of all the real and personal property on the terraqueous globe, can it ever be a disgrace to any other king's son to be industrious? What say you, William?

William. I should rather think it a disgrace to be idle. Indeed all the idle boys at our school are bad boys; and Mr. Turner, our teacher, says all the young men in this parish who have no trades, and whose parents think it a disgrace for them to use their hands, are vicious and likely to be an injury to society.

Olympas. What think you of Eve, William? Was she a good woman?

William. If to acknowledge the Lord in every thing, and to teach religion to one's children, be the marks of a good woman, I think Eve was a good woman; for she acknowledged the Lord when Cain was born, and taught her sons to worship God; and that is all we know of her.

Olympas. How do you know that she so instructed her sons, Eliza?

Eliza. So soon as Cain and Abel are next heard of, they were employed in worshipping God by presenting sacrificial offerings. Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering to the Lord, and Abel also brought some of the best lambs in his flock. Now unless their parents so taught them, I cannot see how they would set about making such religious presents to the Lord.

Olympas. Can any of you tell why these offerings were presented to the Lord? Did he need them? Did he ask them? or were they offered of their own accord?

Reuben. The Lord can need nothing, because his is the heavens and the earth; and he imparts to all whatever they possess and enjoy. But he must have either asked or commanded these offerings; else I know not how they could have thought of presenting either bread or flesh to the Lord who created them for man's use. Please, uncle, explain this subject to us.

Olympas. There is, indeed, no record of the *institution* of these offerings to the Lord; but that they were divinely ordained cannot be doubted—not only from the impossibility of demonstrating how a rational being could conclude by any fair process of reasoning that such things could be pleasing to God who first gave them, more especially in the immediate family of Adam; but also and still more evidently from the fact, that Gud accepted Abel's and rejected Cain's offering. Now where there is no law there is no transgression, and consequently no obedience. There was, then, a law of offerings which Cain transgressed and Abel obeyed. Hence the one was accepted and the other rejected by the Lord.

Olympas. Can you not, Reuben, find in Paul's writings some comment upon the offerings of Cain and Abel?

Reuben. Paul to the Hebrews says, "By *faith* Abel offered to God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain."

Olympas. This, then, is demonstration that there was not only a command for sacrifice, but also some testimony or promise concerning it: for as there can be no *obedience* without law, there can be no *faith* without testimony. In the original there is no word for *excellent:* it is simply "*more sacrifice.*" And the Hebrew may be translated in conformity to this, Gen. iv. 4. "Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering to the Lord: Abel also brought it, and of the firstlings of his flock, and of the fat thereof." That Paul so understood it, is farther evident from these words: "God testified of Abel's *gifts.*" "More sacrifice," then, indicates more gifts. But it was not only because of the number of gifts, but of the principle from which he offered, that he was approbated. Faith distinguished the sacrifice of Abel. Therefore there was some promise, some testimony of God regarded in the offering of Abel, not seen nor regarded in that of Cain. We cannot doubt what that promise was. It was the hope of Adam and of Eve concerning that seed of hers that was ordained to break the serpent's head. Abel's lamb, then, was Christ in type. That rock was Christ, said Paul, when speaking of Horeb. That lamb of Abel was, in the same style, "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Have we any account of slain beasts before the days of Cain and Abel, Thomas?

Thomas Dilworth. That they were slain by God's own appointment before Cain was born, we are not told in so many words; and yet, as you say concerning sacrifice, we are sure they were killed by divine authority; for God clothed Adam and Eve with their skins.

Olympas. Might not those animals whose skins our first parents wore have been killed for food, or have died a natural death?

Thomas D. Man was not allowed to kill and eat till after the flood; and we cannot conceive why animals should already have died; or if they had, we cannot imagine that God would have taken the skins of diseased animals to cover man, respited as he then was, from the grave. There is but one conclusion admissible, viz.—that God taught sacrifice to Adam and Eve immediately after the Fall, and covered them with the skins of the first victims of death. The blood of atonement was the first blood that fell upon this earth; and before a sinner died a sin-offering was made.

Olympas. That is a glorious fact. Satan thought to kill and destroy the whole human race; but before any one died even a natural death

sacrificial lamb was slain, and expiation taught from the day that God tore off the flimsy tattered fig-leaf garments of our parents, and covered them with the spoils of the first death which the sun saw, the winds breathed, or nature heard. Mark the difference between the two suits —that prepared by Adam and that put on by God! How much more permanent and useful the skins of sacrificial victims compared with fig-leaves! Do you recollect, Reuben, when reading the fifth chapter of Romans, what was the definition of the word *atonement?*

Reuben. I think you said it meant a *covering*, inasmuch as the Hebrew word *copher* is rather anglicised than translated by *coffer* or *covering*. The verb *to cover* is frequently translated to atone, to propitiate; because there must be a hiding or *covering* of faults—an expiation—before there can be a reconciliation or a remission.

Olympas. You are right in your recollections. Pray tell me, James, did God accept the offering of Cain?

James. No: he accepted that of Abel, but not that of Cain?

Olympas. Tell me, Thomas, how was this known?

Thomas. By some sensible demonstration. I think when going through Genesis before, you said it was probably consumed by fire from heaven, as was the sacrifice at Aaron's consecration—those offered by Gideon, Solomon, and Elijah on Mount Carmel, &c.

Olympas. We could not explain the wrath of Cain on any other principle, than that there was a manifest acceptance of Abel's offering and a rejection of his. Filled with jealousy and envy, his countenance fell; being the *first born*, and consequently expecting more, he received less than his junior brother. What, Mary, did the Lord say to him?

Mary. He promised him acceptance on doing well, and that he would still have the rights of the first born. And if he failed of these rights, sin was the cause—the only thing in his way.

Olympas. How did this controversy end, Susan?

Susan. Cain killed his brother when they were in the field. But the Lord called him to an account for it, and pronounced a curse upon the very ground that had received the blood of the good Abel.

Olympas. He cursed Cain also; but on his suing for mercy God gave him a sign or pledge that he should not be killed by the hand of violence: for so means the *mark* here spoken of. It is a sign, *token*, or pledge, and not a particular mark on his person. Observe that the first death grew out of religious pride and jealousy. Cain was a persecutor—Abel was a martyr. He died in faith. The first death of an animal was a sin-offering—a covering from guilt. The first man that suffered death was a martyr to the faith in sin-offerings; and the first

Deist was a murderer. Do you recollect, Reuben, any thing that John says on this subject.

Reuben. He asks why did Cain kill Abel? and responds, 'Because his own works were evil and his brother's righteous.'

Olympas. Wicked men sometimes, like Cain, thank God for health, peace, and competence; but they have not that faith in sacrifice which "works by love and purifies the heart."

Reuben. Would you please inform us why you call Abel's offering a *sacrifice?*

Olympas. Paul says by faith he offered more *sacrifice* than Cain. I shall interrogate you at our next reading on *faith;* and especially on the faith of Abel. Meanwhile, what came of Cain after this time?

Reuben. He went into the land of Nod, married a wife, founded a city, and named it for his son.

Olympas. Where did he find his wife?

Reuben. You told us that independent of Cain and Abel, at the time of the birth of Seth, allowing the other children of Adam to have been married at the age of 20, and to have only doubled every 25 years, there would have been when Seth was born, and at the time of Cain's departure to Nod, (or the place of the *vagabond*, as the word indicates,) at least *thirty-three thousand souls.* Amongst these Cain certainly might have found a wife.

Olympas. And what, Thomas Dilworth, were the fortunes of Cain's family?

Thomas. They appear to have been an enterprizing people. Cain founded a city, and gave birth to a numerous family. Indeed the most useful inventions and social improvements were introduced by Cain's descendants.

Olympas. Tell me, Susan, who was it invented tents for graziers and the keeping of travelling herds.

Susan. Jabal, the son of Lamech. He was "the father of all that dwell in tents and keep cattle."

Olympas. And who, Edward, invented harps and organs?

Edward. Jubal, the brother of Jabal. He was a lover of music: and skilled in playing on instruments, one would think, when he invented both *stringed* instruments and wind instruments.

Olympas. Were any other of Cain's posterity famous for useful arts, Elizabeth?

Elizabeth. Yes: Tu-bal-cain was "an instructer of every artificer in brass and iron."

Olympas. Hence we may learn that men of the world are more apt to be enterprizing men in all temporal affairs than the sons of God.

They are more devoted to such improvements as pertain to this life, because it is to them the only life of which they have any idea, and for which they have any relish. You must not, therefore, conclude when you hear persons praised for their enterprize and ingenuity, that such are at all either rational or exemplary characters, unless their enterprize be for the promotion of the spiritual and eternal happiness of men. Cain and his sons down to the first polygamist Lamech, the father of these great inventors, sought stimulus to their minds from worldly pursuits, because they had it not in religion. The other branch of the Adamic family was renowned for piety, and this for carnality and worldly prudence. A. C.

OUR DWELLING PLACE.

YOUNGSTOWN, January 10, 1840.

Beloved Brother—

O! the goodness, the *exuberant goodness*, of our God! How much should we think ourselves obliged to a generous friend, who should build a stately edifice purely for our abode! But how greatly would the obligation be increased, if the hand that built should also *furnish* it! and not only furnish it with all that is commodious and comfortable, but *ornament* it also with whatever is splendid and delightful! *This* has our most indulgent Creator done in a manner infinitely surpassing all we could wish or imagine.

The *earth* is assigned us for a dwelling. The *skies* are stretched over us like a magnificent canopy, dyed in the purest azure; and beautified now with pictures of floating silver—now with colorings of reflected crimson. The *grass* is spread under us as a capacious carpet, wove with silken threads of green, and damasked with flowers of every hue. The *sun*, like a golden lamp, is hung out in the ethereal vault, and pours his effulgence all the day to enlighten our paths. When night approaches the *moon* takes up the friendly office, and the *stars* are kindled in twinkling myriads to cheer the darkness with their milder lustre, and not disturb our repose by too intense a glare. The *clouds*, besides the rich paintings they hand around the heavens, act the part of a shifting screen; and defend us, by their seasonable interposition, from the scorching beams of summer. May we not also regard them as the great watering-pots of the globe, which, wafted on the wings of the wind, dispense their moisture evenly through the universal garden, and fructify with their showers whatever our hand plants? The *fields* are our exhaustless granary. The *ocean* is our vast reservoir. The *animals* spend their strength to despatch our business, resign their clothing to replenish our wardrobe, and surrender their lives to provide for our tables. In short, every *element* is a storehouse of conveniences; every *season* brings us the choicest productions; all *nature* is our caterer; and, which is a most endearing recommendation of these favors, they are all as lovely as they are useful. You observe nothing

mean or inelegant. All is clad in *beauty's* fairest robe, and regulated by *proportion's* nicest rule. The whole scene exhibits a fund of pleasure to the imagination, at the same time that it more than supplies all our wants.

Therefore thou art inexcusable, O man! whosoever thou art, that *rebellest* against thy Maker. He surrounds thee with unnumbered benefits, and follows thee with an effusion of the richest, noblest gifts. He courts thy affections, he solicits thy gratitude by liberalities which are never intermitted—by a bounty which knows no limits. Most blessed Lord, let this thy goodness lead us to repentance. *Win* us to thyself, thou fountain of felicity, by these sweet inducements. *Draw* us to our duty, thou God of our salvation, by these "cords of love."

In the name of the author, I abide yours in Him who was made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man, humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.

JAMES HERVEY.

STRICTURES ON CHRISTIANOS.

JAMESTOWN, OHIO, December 26, 1839.

Dear brother Campbell,

THE HARBINGER, No. XII. came to hand by the last mail, and in reading over its contents I met with Christianos' No. IX, which he devoted to me. And often as I had read it through it reminded me of some very tender mothers, who, without waiting to ascertain precisely the fault of the child, boxes its ears unmercifully, and then gives it a lump of sugar to pacify it.

I almost regret that I diverted the attention of Christianos from his "great work," and it is to be the more regretted, because the object of his strictures was so unfortunate as to write his own condemnation in his first sentence, and who was so reckless of reputation as to misrepresent. I frankly acknowledged in the outset that I had not read all that Christianos had written on the subject of "heart religion;" but I had read enough to ascertain that he conveyed the idea that "heart religion" might and did exist apart from "head religion:" that I think he will hardly deny: and that is the very thing I struck at. And although Christianos read my "*piquant letter*" very carefully no doubt, still he overlooked almost as many things in mine as I did in his. He entirely overrun the other speakers and writers on "heart religion" which I associated with him, and he did not read my piece to the end, else he would have noticed that I prohibited the publication unless *all the others* were included with him. Will Christianos venture to say that I *caricatured* and *misrepresented* the views of all who have written on "heart religion"? I think he will not. Then he ought not to have boxed me so hastily: *'he laid hands on me too suddenly.'* Christianos would have us believe that he hates controversy, and at the same time no man, perhaps, delights more in writing on controverted subjects. He reminded me of a host of speakers who circuit round and round

condemning controversy every where, and preaching all the time against immersion. They love to controvert by themselves, because they can do it to better advantage than when they have help.

But that I may also be fully understood, I will repeat again that "heart religion" without "head religion," (if there be any such thing,) is an *ignorant religion;* and if it saves any body, they are saved by *ignorance.* And that I may not be accused of misrepresentation again, I will quote Christianos' own words. He says, "A man may be ignorant of the import and action of baptism, and of all the ordinances, and yet be in character a Christian—an accepted worshipper of God." This comes very near saying that a man may worship God acceptably without a revelation on the subject, or without knowing God's ordinances, or how to perform them. Whereas I had supposed that the worship of God consisted in the doing of the things commanded and appointed by him. Thus the Jews worshipped him. But Christianos has a way of distinguishing Christian character without Christian actions! He may show his Christianity without actions, if he can; but I will endeavor to show mine *by my actions.* This abstract Christian character, so frequently spoken of, is a ghost that has no real existence. To talk about Christian character that has not been formed by the teaching of Jesus Christ, is like talking about day-light which has not been derived from the rays of the sun; and if it be admitted that all Christian character emanates from the teaching of Christ, then it follows of course that the character is limited by the teaching or knowledge imparted.

If I do not misunderstand Christianos, he takes the position that God may be acceptably worshipped without ordinances; that is to say, a man may not know what God requires of him, and yet worship him acceptably. If that would not be worship without faith, I could not describe such worship.

I will now barely hint at one other thing, and then let Christianos go on with his "great work;" and that thing is the frequent quoting of the prayers of Prophets requesting God to make known unto them his will, and putting those prayers into the mouths of men now, as though God would now make special revelations to men, or reveal his will through some other medium than the scriptures. Thus—"Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" is frequently quoted as a proper prayer for men to use now, as though God would send a special messenger to tell them what to do, as he did to Saul of Tarsus. This misapplication of the scriptures is the very thing that keeps men in superstition, waiting for God to do something for them that he has not done, and to make their duty known to them in some other way than through the written word.

But God has made his will, and man's duty fully known in the scriptures; and he that is found excusing himself for want of knowledge, and asking God to give him knowledge while he refuses to obey the things which God has commanded in the scriptures, and which he can have daily access to, may look for the sentence of condemnation to rest upon him.

Christianos says he "loathes controversy;" but he has put forth some affirmations that will not pass on his own *ipse dixit:* such as, "A man may be ignorant of the true import and action of all the Christian

ordinances, and yet be in character a Christian—an accepted worshipper of God." Again—"I affirm that not one of the ordinances is absolutely essential to spiritual life; and that they have no connexion with future life and bliss, *only as they tend to the formation of Christian character.*" This last affirmation looks to me to cross a previous one at right angles. Thus, in one of these affirmations Christianos says that *the ordinances tend to the formation of Christian character;* and in the other he says, "*A man may be ignorant of the import of the ordinances, and yet have a Christian character.*" That is to say, a man may be ignorant of that which tends to form Christian character, and yet have a Christian character. He might as well tell me that corn may grow without earth. But Christianos hates controversy, and I will now take his proffered hand, and go up with him as high as he desires, (unless he goes above what is written,) to partake of all the exceeding great and precious promises, *by which we are made partakers of the divine nature.*

Affectionately yours,

M. WINANS.

REMARKS ON THE ABOVE.

The preceding communication ought to have appeared in our last number. It was unintentionally overlooked.

The caption, "Christians among the sects," is, in my judgment, like 'Christians among the nations,' or 'Christians in the world.' I do not approve of all that has been written under this singular caption, and have been waiting for an opportunity to say so. Many good things and excellent things have been said. But Job's three friends said as many good and excellent things, and said them as elegantly too; yet the Lord did not thank them for it, because they had misapplied them. So I think some of these good sayings and just views are not in their proper place; and, taken altogether, do not make the identical impression which they would have made in the hands of those who uttered them. Of this, however, more specifically on some more suitable occasion.

If perfection in all revealed knowledge, and in obedience to every precept, were indispensable to a Christian, then where would be the Christians in the sects or out of them! This heart religion contrasted with the head, is not in the diction of the Holy Spirit. *There is no head religion.* There may be cold unfeeling speculations upon religious doctrines, principles, &c.; but there is no religion in such matters.

Every thing depends on the definitions of this word *Christian*, before we decide where he may be found. The disciples of Christ were those who first received that name. Now what is a *disciple of Christ?* Are there any disciples of Christ among the religious sects? That there are, no one of much intelligence can doubt. The phrase *disciple of*

Christ did not uniformly represent those who believed and practised all the same things; for those called *disciples of Christ* in the New Testament at one time had very imperfect views of Christ's religion, and had not been baptized in the same baptism. Still Nicodemus, Joseph of Arimathea, and many of less fame, who knew only the the baptism of John, were amongst Christ's disciples. These disciples, had grown much in the Christian knowledge, and had been immersed into Christ's death, who first received this name in Antioch. Now if we use the word Christian as used in Antioch, none can wear it unless he resembles the Antiochans in knowledge and practice: but if we use the phrase "disciples of Christ," as commonly used in the New Testament, we may, perhaps, find many of them among the sects! This is an important point, but we shall leave the development of it to a more convenient season. A. C.

DIFFICULTIES IN CHURCHES—*No. II.*

It has been queried by a correspondent from New Lisbon, Ohio—'Is age alone a qualification for office?' If not in these identical words, such is the naked question. This query, accompanied with some judicious remarks, has been propounded on the suggestion offered in our first reason (No. 1.) for a senate or an eldership in every congregation—'Because, in the nature of the case, old men are better accomplished for the task; and if not very near the people, are very near to God, and must soon give an account to him.' What, then, do we mean by old men? Old men simply, or old men in the Christian profession? Not old men simply: for age alone is no qualification for any office, any more than sincerity in a pretender is a proof of the righteousness of his pretensions. Without sincerity there is no virtue; and yet sincerity alone is no virtue. Without oxygen there is no atmosphere; and yet oxygen is not atmosphere. Age is a relative term. Moses was old at 120 years; and yet Methuselah was a young man, only in his prime, when 500 years old. Timothy at 30 was an older man in the Lord than Sergius Paulus at 60.

Age in the Christian life is better than age in animal life. I have sometimes seen very old men very great babes both in Christ and in common prudence. I have forgotten whether it was Zeno or Seneca who said, "Prudence is the queen of all the virtues." No matter who said it: it is true; and more especially in reference to all governmental matters. Now as wisdom dwells with prudence, and both tabernacle

in the tent of years, we generally expect to find them there rather than in the abodes of youth—

"We are warn'd by the wisdom of age,
And cheer'd by the sallies of youth.'

Elihu has said that "days should speak, and multitude of years should teach wisdom."

Grace only adorns the native faculties of the soul. It imparts no new ones. Therefore, the things wanting in the physical and intellectual structure of man are not to be supplied by converting and redeeming grace. I acknowledge that a man's energies may be improved by the faith of Christ, because that faith excites, rouses, and consequently improves the energies of man. While it does not appear that all industrious, active, enterprizing persons are Christians, evident it is that all true-hearted Christians are industrious, active, and energetic characters.

As before observed, under the Jewish theocracy, in its best days, elders governed the nation. They were, however, select men: "He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God." This was the archetype of all their ideas of rulers. So did Moses choose and appoint "out of all the people *able men*, such as fear God, men of truth, hating covetousness;" and "made them heads over the people."* "So I took of the chief of your tribes, wise men and known, and made them heads over you."† But we shall be told that this was in the state government. And does that change the necessity of government, or of able and just men to administer it? Not in the least: for if state governors and rulers should be *able* and *just* men, much more they who preside over the church of God? But the Jewish state was all church, and their church was all state; and in every imaginable point of view their wisdom and policy are models worthy of our imitation.

But yet there is no eternal compact between years and wisdom: and, therefore, while we look up to many years, it is only when these years have been consecrated to the Lord, and are characterized by justice, energy, and discretion. Old men, without these great attributes, are not to be trusted with the government of a church. That elders may rule well, they must be able to rule well. Now no man destitute of decision of character, self-government, and energy, ever can well manage any concern, domestic, ecclesiastic, or political.

Paul, in laying down the qualifications for a bishop, says he must be *fit to teach*. This is equivalent to the "able man" of Moses; and he must be just, ruling well his own house as a proof of it. The qualifications are substantially the same—capacity to teach and capacity to rule.

* Exodus xviii. 21-25. † Deuteronomy i. 15, 16.

The former requires intellect and knowledge—the latter, justice and energy of character. The first qualification makes a man able—the second makes him just.

Paul commands the man that rules to mind his calling—"Let him rule with diligence." But according to the fierce democracy of congregationalism, all are equally rulers, and the office of which Paul spoke is extinct. Now as we plead for the primitive order of things, we plead for a senate in every church where it can be had—for a presbytery of *able* and *just* men—men that can discriminate, and who will judge righteous judgment—who will firmly, and without partiality, execute the laws of Christ.

This is the most direct and effectual prevention of disorder in churches. So the Apostles thought, else they would not have had things to assume this order from the beginning. Nor would they have so strictly charged both the rulers and the ruled on the whole subject of their relative duties. While invested with high authority, the rulers are not to be "lords over God's heritage;" and while all are equal as brethren in Christ Jesus, the ruled are to "submit to them who watch over them and admonish them in the Lord, and to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake," and to live in peace among themselves.

I will only add in the present essay, that while one of the qualifications is relative, the other is absolute. A man's ability or aptitude to teach, is always to be measured by the capacity and progress of the learners. But the moral qualifications are not comparative, or in degree; but perfect and entire, wanting nothing. "He that ruleth over men *must be just*—not comparatively, but just—one that does nothing in the name of the Lord by partiality—one that knows no man according to the flesh; but fears God supremely, and executes his laws uprightly. Such a person ruling with diligence, is one of God's best gifts to any community, religious or political. A. C.

NEW INSTITUTION—*No. II.*

The four cardinal points in infant training are, the full development of all the bodily powers—the cultivation of the intellectual faculties—the full expansion and proper direction of the moral powers and capacities—and the establishment of the graceful habits of courteous action and demeanor in the social relations of life. If these are not attempted and secured in the morning dawn of reason and the moral sense, they

never can be so successfully attempted at or after the period of adolescence. These must go hand in hand, and be a component portion of the educational bill of fare of every day.

Now among the points no longer to be debated, the subjects indubitably established, no one is more evident nor more important to those entrusted with the training of children, than that every power, whether designated physical, intellectual, or moral, is to be enlarged, strengthened, improved, and polished by exercise. The muscles, the perceptive powers, the reflective, the moral sentiments, the feelings, the affections are to be every day employed and exercised on objects and in actions suitable to their nature and functions. Therefore in the founding of an institution provision ought to be made for such a course of training.

All the amusements of children may be, and indeed ought to be, promotive of some one or other of these four cardinal points. Not an hour of the whole period of school-days should be allowed to pass without reference to one or more of these great objects of a rational and useful education.

The anatomy of the human frame, so far at least as the mechanism of the "house we live in" is concerned, its bones, its joints, and ligaments, the vital organs, the arteries, veins, nerves, muscles, with the uses of most of our members, may be so simplified and so happily adapted to ch ,dhood as to become highly interesting to very young children. And what more necessary to the preservation of health and life? In the every day details of human misfortunes and disasters, I see a large number of them are such that a proper education would certainly have prevented. Multitudes are daily languishing and dying through their ignorance of their own organization and of the laws of physical nature, whose years might have been lengthened to the full period allotted man, and also exempted from those infirmities, had the hours which have been squandered in idleness or consumed in useless and unavailable learning been well applied and properly directed to these most useful and religious studies. I say *religious:* for if "an undevout astronomer be mad," an undevout anatomist is no less so. The study of the human eye, ear, and hand, of the brain, the heart, the lungs, the liver, &c., as certainly fill the human soul with admiration of its Author, and with the sentiments of piety and devotion, as the study of the Bible itself; provided only, it be under the direction of a proper tutor. The works of God explain his word, and his word explains his works; and these together make a man wise unto temporal, spiritual, and eternal salvation.

How preposterous the years spent on the syntax and prosody of dead signs, while the syntax and prosody of the living things signified by

those signs are neither studied nor known! Education in this point needs reformation as much as did the See and superstition of Rome in the days of Luther.

The exercises of children may be, in part at least, as amusing to themselves in planting and managing a vine, a shrub, a flower—in cultivating a small farm of one square rod, or of ten, as in romping over the turf in violent efforts for mastery in frivolous *pastimes*, (a word which ought never to be practically understood at school,) which rather corrupt than improve both their morals and their taste.

Fishing, fowling, and hunting, when free from violent efforts or circumstances of danger, as interludes at certain seasons, may be both innocently and advantageously permitted; as well as swimming, riding, and walking, for those who are approaching the period of adolescence; but at first, and indeed usually, these amusements are to be pursued in the company of a tutor, who explains every thing and restrains from every thing detrimental to health or morals. Agriculture, both theory and practice, is but beginning to command the respect and attention due to this most useful, honorable, and princely of all human callings and pursuits. This, next to religion and morality, and the art of reading and writing, ought to be taught in all its branches, from the infant school and upwards, to the last lecture in the last course.

Soils, earths, minerals, rocks, fences, buildings, manures, grains, grasses, fruits of all kinds, stock, from the Arabian horse, down to the size and quality of the various sorts of eggs in the poultry yard, ought to be made familiar topics with all pupils.

The making of experiments in all these departments furnishes an innocent and profitable employment, favorable to the expansion of mind and muscle, of head and heart; and consequently in diffusing valuable lights through all society, as profitable to the state as it is to the youth, who are thus rationally, scientifically, and morally fitted to be the benefactors of society.

I intend no more in these intimations than general views of that system of education which we have in contemplation for the proposed institution; and especially for the domestic and primary school department of it. The systematic details of these matters are neither necessary nor expedient in this place. A. C.

ELEGANT EXTRACTS—*No. I.*

Louisville, Ky., December 24, 1829.

Dear brother Campbell—During your brief sojourn here, alas! too brief for me, even if it had been extended to a twelvemonth, I did not

get a chance to converse with you about CARLYLE, a Scotch writer, who evinces as much research, learning, skill, and earnest search for truth, with a style generally as eloquent as any European writer it has been my delighted province to read. I feel confident you would be greatly pleased with him in many things; and by way of testing that, I shall probably fill this sheet with extracts from an article on Samuel Johnson, and on Diderot. The article on Diderot, the French cyclopedist, opens in the following strongly expressed manner:—

"The *Acts* of the *Christian Apostles*, on which, as we may say, the world has, now for eighteen centuries, had its foundation, are written in so small a compass, that they can be read in one little hour. The *Acts* of the *French Philosophers*, the importance of which is already fast exhausting itself, lie recorded in whole acres of typography, and would furnish reading for a lifetime. Nor is the stock, as we say, yet anywise complete, or within computable distance of completion. Here are four quite new octavos,* recording the labors, voyages, victories, amours, and indigestions of the Apostle Dennis: it is but a year or two since a new contribution on Voltaire came before us; since Jean Jacques had a new *life* written for him; and then of those *Feuilles de Grimm*, what incalculable masses may yet lie dormant in the Petersburg Library, waiting only to be awakened and let slip!—Reading for a lifetime! Thomas Parr might begin reading in long-clothes, and stop in his last hundred and fiftieth year, without having ended. And then as to when the process of addition will cease, and the Acts and Epistles of the Parisian church of Antichrist will have completed themselves; except in so far as the quantity of paper written on, or even manufactured, in those days being finite and not infinite, the business one day or other must cease, and the antichristian canon close for the last time—we yet know nothing."

Of the difference between Atheism and a false profession he thus discourses:—

"What is the nature of that individual, who, with hysterical violence theoretically asserts a God, perhaps a revealed symbol and worship of God; and for the rest, in thought, word, and conduct, meet with him where you will, is found living as if his theory were some polite figure of speech, and his theoretical God a mere distant simulacrum, with whom he, for his part, had nothing further to do? Fool! the ETERNAL is no simulacrum; God is not only there, but here, or no where, in that life-breath of thine, in that act and thought of thine—and thou wert wise to look to it. If there is no God, as the fool hath said in his heart, then live on in thy decencies, and life homages, and inward greed and falsehood, and all the cunningly devised halfness that recommends thee to the mammon of this world! If there is a God, we say look to it! But in either case, what art thou? The Atheist is false; yet is there, as we see, a portion of truth in him: he is *true* compared with thee; thou, unhappy mortal, livest wholly in a lie, art wholly a lie."——So much for Diderot.

Since closing the enclosed I have met with another specimen in

* Memoirs, Correspondence, and Works of Diderot, by the author of *Grimm*, 4 tom 8vo. Works of Dennis Diderot, preceded by Historical and Philosophical Memoirs, 22 tom. 8vo. Paris, 1831.

Carlyle, which I must quote. It is taken from an article entitled "*Characteristics:*"—

"To begin with our highest spiritual function, with religion, we might ask, Whither has religion now fled? Of churches and their establishments we here say nothing; nor of the unhappy domains of unbelief, and how innumerable men, blinded in their own minds, must live without God in the world; but, taking the fairest side of the matter, we ask, What is the nature of that same religion, which still lingers in the hearts of the few who are called, and call themselves specially the religious? Is it a healthy religion, vital, unconscious of itself; that shines forth spontaneously in doing of the work, or even in preaching of the word? Unhappily, no. Instead of heroic martyr conduct, and inspired and soul eloquence, whereby religion itself were brought home to our living bosoms, to live and reign there, we have 'Discourses on the Evidences,' endeavoring with smallest assault to make it probable that such a thing as religion exists. The most enthusiastic evangelists do not preach a gospel, but keep describing how it should and might be preached; to awaken the sacred fire of Faith, as by a sacred contagion, is not their endeavor; but, at most, to describe how faith shows and acts, and scientifically distinguish true faith from false Religion, like all else, is conscious of itself, listens to itself; it becomes less and less creative, vital; more and more mechanical. Considered as a whole, the Christian religion, of late ages, has been continually dissipating itself into metaphysics; and threatens now to disappear, as some rivers do, in deserts of barren sand."

T. S. BELL.

QUESTIONS AND DEFINITIONS—*No. III.*

[Questions from Amelia, Va.]

"Mr. Hendricks says there are but two arguments against infant baptism." The first is, "A person who has a right to a positive institution of God's house, must be expressly mentioned as having that right; but infants are not so mentioned, therefore they have not that right, and are not to be baptized." "This argument he sets aside on the ground that it excludes females from the Lord's supper. How do *you* answer his objection?"

I answer it as follows:—First, the argument is so manufactured that it may be easily refuted. I know of no Baptist who so expresses himself on the subject of baptism. We affirm that *positive* institutions are not to be gathered from circumstances, nor made up of inferences; but are always based on positive precepts as respects three things:—1st. The *action* commanded. 2d. The *qualification* of the *subject* (not the "*person*") as above stated. 3d. The *design* of the institution. Positive institutions require positive precepts on these three points—*action*,

subject, design. Such were the precepts for the Sabbath, circumcision, passover, sin-offerings, and the various offerings under the Law—baptism, the Lord's supper. These precepts are either in express words, or express examples—often both.

Now, my dear sir, not "the *person*," but the *character* must be pointed out. It is not infant, adult, man or woman, as such; but qualified persons—that is, *characters*, who are pointed out as the subjects of baptism. There is "neither *male* nor *female*," blood, family, nor condition in life, "bond or free," Barbarian, Scythian, Greek, Roman, &c. in Christ's institution; but a *believing penitent*. The qualifications for Christ's church are not *blood*, *person*, nor *family*; but *faith*.

The argument when corrected stands thus:—The qualified subjects of positive institutions must be expressly stated in the laws of those institutions. But unintelligent and unbelieving persons are not found in the laws concerning baptism: therefore no unintelligent nor unbelieving person is a proper subject of baptism. Now what has this to do with male, female, or infant? It is a downright and palpable sophism. I do not adopt this verbiage to get rid of any difficulty concerning female communion; but for the sake of placing the subject on its proper merits.

The perverse, or perhaps quizzical ingenuity displayed in trying to evade the argument for positive institutions by a reference to female communion, only proves that however innocent other errorists may be on this subject, the inventor of this manœuvre is not among them.

But suppose we show that there is nothing in this exception, then the argument, even as stated by Mr. H., is by him unanswerable. Thus: In Christ there is no male nor female as respects ordinances of religion. In Moses there was. Consequently believing females as well as males are proper subjects of all Christian institutions. But if this will not satisfy this morbid taste, we can show that females were received to the Lord's table by the Apostles. See Acts 1st and 2d chapters. The names of some of the *women* and men that composed the *one hundred and twenty disciples* are given in the first chapter. In the second we are told that three thousand were added to *them*—the one hundred and twenty; and then we are told that after their baptism, *they* (the 3120) continued stedfast in breaking the loaf. Here then is positive evidence of female communion in the loaf. Can any one show the same for infant sprinkling or infant immersion? When this is disposed of we may find another instance or two.

The second argument against infant baptism, which he honers with the name of argument, is, that "the scriptures require faith and repentance as requisites to baptism." But as infants cannot have these,

they are therefore not fit subjects for baptism. This he refutes by alleging that the conclusion is not found in the premises, because the scriptures "require faith and repentance only of adults." What glaring sophism, says he, "*adults* in the premises and infants in the conclusion!" What still more glaring sophism, I say, to have infants either in the premises or in the conclusion! This is another domestic argument, made for home consumption, and farther displays the same sophistical ingenuity! The argument used by me is this:—1st. The subjects of all religious ordinances are *qualified persons*. 2d. The specification of any qualification for any ordinance positively excludes all those persons who have not that qualification 3d. Therefore when it says, "*Repent and be baptized*," it is equivalent to saying, Unless you repent be not baptized, just as positive affirmative and negative precepts always prohibit and command their contraries. *Be honest*, forbids theft. "Thou shalt not steal," enjoins honesty." "If thou dost not believe thou mayest not." To name infants at all on the same page with baptism is always an assumption, because they are not found once in Old or New Testement on the same page with that sacred ordinance which by the Apostles never was administered to any but to an intelligent person. A. C.

QUESTIONS AND DIFINITIONS—*No. IV.*

Query 7. "Is it not a violation of the law of Jesus Christ in any case, or under any circumstances, for brethren to go to law with one another?"

Answer. So Paul would have decided—nay, did decide, 1 Cor. vii. They may go to the Christian law—to the courts of Jesus Christ, and by its decisions they must abide. But then the church must promptly and faithfully attend to such matters. The church has no power of compulsion, save the holy, spiritual, and divine obligations of the Christian precepts, promises, and their proper motives. While, then, the parties submit to the decisions of the church, justice will be dispensed; for church officers are bound to administer justice in all matters according to the Christian morality. But if either party absolutely refuse to submit to the Christian law and the decision of the church, then he must be given over to the secular power, which has its own sanctions and ministers of law and justice, that can, and often do compel acquiescence. Such is my opinion of the matter. Indeed, no member of a church can be allowed to do any injustice to a brother, if so be the

church is properly organized, and has a sensible, judicious, and efficient presbytery to preside over its interests.

Query 8. Can an individual belonging to the church assign or transfer to an alien, for the purpose of coercing the payment of a claim or debt which he holds on his brother in the church, without an infraction of the law of Christ?

Answer. A person is always understood to do what his agent does, provided only his agent acts according to his views. This being incontrovertible, he that sues through an agent, sues. The concurrence of the agent with him, because of its having been made his interest to sue, does not alter the nature of the action of the principal. A brother may, as honorably and as acceptably to the Lord and his people, coerce payment by a civil action, as put the claim into an alien's hand to do it. He may hide himself from the reprehensions of the church, or of the world, who know it not; but he cannot escape the reprehension of God and his own conscience for such unbrotherly conduct.

In matters of contract—of covenant—indeed in all business transactions amongst brethren, whether natural or spiritnal brethren, the same exact regard to justice, promise, punctuality, &c., ought to be cultivated, exhibited, and expected, as from the most perfect strangers. Otherwise confidence fails and covenants cease to be of any value; and when once the habit of violating engagements and breaking promises is formed, there is no predicting in what bankruptcy of faith and morals it may end. It is uniformly better to make no engagements than to break the least promise. The Lord does not require it, and cannot be pleased with covenant breakers of any sort.

A. C.

News from the Churches.

Juvenile Seminary, Ky January 91, 1840

Beloved Brother—While other *disciples* are rejoicing the hearts of the *brethren*, strengthe ning the bands of the *faithful*, and swelling the tide of love among all true *Christians*, by the cheering reports of the success of the gospel; it were churlish in me, having feasted richly on the contributions of others, to withhold the means (limited though they be) of heightening the general joy.

Circumstances compel me to give diligent attention to *some* employment for the support of a numerous and helpless family. The interest of my children has determined me to resume my wonted avocation of teaching. This leaves me but two days in seven for preaching.

Within the last fifteen months I have labored at different points in Mason, Bracken, and Harrison, some of which I will here notice.

At *Pompelia's*, in the south-west of Mason, aided by brother S. V. Lee, we have constituted a church of about 20 members; a large majority of whom we have recently immersed. To the labors of brother Lee, chiefly, are we indebted for this accession.

At *Thompson's*, in the southern part of Bracken, in September, 1838, we held a meeting, got up by S. V. Lee; by whom, with brother David Snodgrass, we were ably supported. Thirty-seven were added—thirty-three by immersion—and four from the Baptists. On the next Saturday brother Lee and myself returned to this point, continued three days, and immersed ten. Two weeks after, this faithful brother and myself rallied again at this place. We continued three days and immersed eighteen. In the month of August last I again co-operated with brethren Lee and Snodgrass at a meeting in the same place. There were 21 added at this time, 15 of whom confessed the Lord and put him on. This church increased from 13, to 130 members in less than one year.

In November, 1838, I held a three days' meeting at brother S. V. Lee's own house. He and brother John Pope of Harrison, taking part in the labors. We continued eight days; eight made the good confession and were added to the saved.

Through the last winter my operations were mainly confined to Frank's, a vicinity in the interior of Bracken, in which our views of the gospel had never before been published. Here I disciplined eleven, ten of whom have united at Germantown.

In May I held a meeting near Colemansville, in Harrison, which I cannot soon forget. Twelve were added, seven of whom I immersed. Through the latter part of the summer and fall I visited Richland, in Harrison; a point at which, a short time before my first visit, brethren R. C. Ricketts and S. V. Lee had held a very interesting meeting: having immersed three persons and constituted a church of about 20 members. Brethren Lee, Jos Mitchell, and myself, have held several meetings at this point since, and have immersed sixteen, reclaimed three, and added several more from different denominations. But for being too tedious, I would name several other points, at which, within the time above specified, I have labored with success: suffice it to say, that connected with my own labors from Sept. '38 to Dec, '39, about 150 have been added to the Lord. "Bless his holy name, O my soul!"

Brethren J. J. Moss and J T. Johnson will, I presume, report to you, within a few days, if they have not already done it, the glorious triumphs of the gospel, at Beasley, Minerva, Germantown, and Dover, within the last few days.

JOHN M. HOLTON.

Wilkinson county, Mi., January 20, 1840.

Through divine favor since I wrote you I have been privileged to make a tour from this through a corner of Franklin county, to Fayette, the county town of Jefferson county; thence to Port Gibson, and Grand Gulf in Claiborne county, a distance of some seventy or eighty miles.

On Well's Creek, in Franklin county, there are a few disciples of our Lord; but in rather a scattered condition. At Fayette a church of Christ has recently been organized of about twelve members, and prospects flattering with regard to their future and reputable increase.

Port Gibson is a beautiful town, and one of the most inviting fields for an Evangelist I have yet seen in the south. There is a congregation of disciples at Grand Gulf, embracing several worthy members; but I do not think the prospect of their future and permanent increase flattering. At the present time I consider Fayette, Consolation and Woodville as the most eligible for concentrating our efforts. Our present arrangement is stately at Consolation the first and third Lord's days in the month; at Woodville the second and fourth; subject, however, to occasional variations.

Brother Matthews and myself expect to devote our whole time to the work, publicly and from house to house. There appears to be a reviving interest in the minds of our brethren and sisters, which I think augurs well for our future success.

My own and the health of my family is moderately good. Praised be the name of God our Father for his mercies!

CAREY SMITH.

Russelville, Putnam county, Indiana, January 28, 1840.

Since my last communication to you, I have witnessed the happy surrender of some fifty or sixty persons to the King's cause. We have better times than formerly. Prospects bid fair for a happier day than we have yet seen. In the counties of Montgomery, Hendrix, and Putnam, there are some eight Evangelists, viz.—John Shane, G. T Harvey, N. Waters, T. Lockhart, T. J. Matlock, A. Prather, George Pearcy, and myself.

JOHN M. HARRIS.

Baltimore, Md., February 1, 1840.

While the opportunity occurs I will just embrace it by saying a few words in relation to the recent reconciliation that has taken place among the brethren here. I have no doubt but it is of a permanent character, and that much good will be the result. We have already had eleven additions, and a prospect that the number will soon be much increased. But this is not all: there is evidently an increasing disposition to return to that state of Christian confidence, esteem, and affection that formerly existe among us, and which is so essentially necessary to the progress of the cause of truth as well as our individual welfare. We are therefore disposed to thank God and take courage.

FRANCIS D. DUNGAN.

Cincinnati, Ohio, February 8. 1840.

The last Lord's day was an extraordinary one for our city, and evinced the rapid progress which the truth is making in these parts, as the following facts will show.

As our congregation, on Sycamore street, were advancing towards the river, at the close of the morning service, we saw a large concourse of persons on the opposite side of the river, (Covington) engaged in an immersion; and as we approached towards our place of immersion at the foot of Elm street, where we buried twenty-three in the Ohio, and raised them to walk in newness of life. Our colored brethren were just returning from the same spot, where they had immersed eight persons, and on the hill at Ninth street congregation brother Lynds at the same time he immersed seventeen persons. For all which accessions to the kingdom of God we bless the name of the Lord. Up to the present date we have immersed some sixty or seventy persons, during the progress of our meetings.

JAMES CHALLEN.

Minerva, Ky., February 1, 1840.

I have desired these many days to write unto you, that I might add to the general joy of both you and me, by informing you of the condition of the church of Christ at Bracken meeting-house; but have hitherto been hindered by causes to some extent over which I had no control. But since I have broken silence in a note I had the pleasure of endorsing in a letter written you by our beloved brother J. J. Moss, I will still farther trespass upon your patience by giving you a more extended account of our condition as a church, and also the pleasing intelligence of the glorious triumph of truth in this section, since I addressed you that note.

The church at Bracken numbers about 115 with the recent acquisitions. Two or three years since our number was much larger than now; but the congregation at Dover was chiefly made up of members of our congregation, which reduced us, until recently, down to about 95. We are in good order, so far as the prerequisites of a church organization is concerned. We have two Elders, Daniel Runyan and A. G. Burgess, four Deacons, E. P. Thompson, Samuel Frazer, Julius G. Coleman, and William H. Conner. We meet on the first day of every week for social worship, breaking of bread and prayer, except on the first Lord's day in every month, when our meeting-house is occupied by our old Baptist brethren. So much for the church at Bracken.

I now inform you that since I wrote you as above stated, brethren Moss and John T. Johnson have been laboring at this place and Dover with great success, not as to numbers particularly, but character. Men who have stood aloof and unconcerned as to matters pertaining to the Christian religion, have come out from among the wicked, and have been planted together in the vineyard of our heavenly Redeemer. Our whole country is in a state of feverish excitement. Opposition is nearly abandoned, for the public mind begins to find out the truth, and to defend it. These brethren are now holding a meeting at Germantown, of the result of which you will doubtless soon be informed. From Germantown they go to *Augusta*. What a battle will there be fought!!!

Brother Campbell, you must not pass us by, as you have done hitherto. If you could visit us here you would do more good than many places where you stop. I do not speak from feeling when I assure you that I never saw a finer prospect of doing good in any quarter, than exists here at this time.* Brother Ricketts has just concluded a meeting at Lawrence's creek meeting-house, where some fifty odd obeyed the Lord. In all these additions at the different points the most respectable in the community, of both male and female, have enlisted in the good cause. Blessed be the name of the Lord!

Greet all the holy brethren, and accept for yourself my best wishes for your future health and prosperity.

A. G. BURGESS.

Palestine, Illinois, February 6, 1840.

Brothers Trimble and Tichenor have been unfolding the doctrine of the reformation in our vicinage occasionally for the last six weeks, and thirty-eight had been induced to obey the gospel; when the sects becoming alarmed, commenced a tirade of preaching—of mystification and perversion, in order to arrest its progress. The consequence was a public discussion between brother Trimble and Elder R. M. Newport, of the *two seed* Baptist denomination on the two following propositions:—"1. Faith comes by hearing the word of God." 2d. "Faith, repentance, and baptism, are the instituted means of pardon. This is the process through which the alien becomes a citizen of the kingdom of Jesus Christ."

Brother Tichenor triumphantly sustained the affirmative of both propositions. After the discussion closed, notwithstanding the inclemency of the weather, for the thermometer fell to 16 degrees below zero, twelve more obeyed and were added to the congregation, and there is yet several others who design to do likewise, so that our congregation now, although only about a month since it dates its constitution, numbers 50 regular communicants. I attribute to this fact as a demonstration of the decided victory and triumph of truth over error. For although the sects, Presbyterian and Methodistic, warmly espoused and bolstered up Newport, and for the time being effected a *temporary* union, not a *single individual* enlisted under their banners or obeyed the gospel, from the exhibition of *their system*, preferring to embrace and yield obedience to the gospel as proclaimed by Jesus and his Apostles as exemplified at the setting up of the kingdom at *Jerusalem* on the day of Pentecost.

ALFRED G. LAGON.

* I hope some day to call at Augusta, and visit a little round that point; but cannot now say when.

A. C.

FOUR PRESSING WANTS.

We want in every Christian family a regular and well administered system of moral and religious training—we want a Sunday school in every town and neighborhood where there are children to educate—we want a well administered system of church edification and discipline in every professing community; and we want a great deal more liberality on the part of many brethren in the consecration of their property to the advancement of the kingdom of Christ in the world. I say, we want these four things more than any other four *means*, after prayer, to the prosperity of the cause to which so many of us have sworn eternal devotion. Many households are without religious and moral culture; many villages and congregations are without a Sunday school to bless the infant generation, which by others are seized and hurried into the ranks of sectarianism. We want a better system of church edification—more zeal, punctuality in attendance—more Bible reading—more religious conversation—more sanctification of the first day to the Lord—a more solemn deep engagedness in the worship of the Lord—a higher, purer, more scriptural morality. And because of the feeble pulsations of Christian liberality, many useful brethren are confined to their families; some have had to leave the field of labor altogether; and some talk of the same necessity coming upon them.

I know, indeed, we have many, very many liberal and wealthy brethren, that do much and that will do much for the eternal cause of humanity and religion: but all are not doing what they can nor what they ought, unless they intend to be rich in this world and poor in the next!

Had we now five hundred new evangelists in the field, such as some scores that I could name, what victories would be shouted, what triumphs would be sung all over the land! how many myriads would be given to us forever! how many blessings would adorn our inheritance, and be our crown of rejoicing as a community in the day of the Lord!

Brethren in the Lord, fellow-soldiers under the great king, citizens of Zion, heirs of immortality, what do you say? Shall we much longer want these four things? Let every man do his duty; and, as many drops make an ocean, and many sands a mountain, then shall we spread from sea to sea, and be strong as the hills round about Jerusalem!

A. C.

PASSIVE OBEDIENCE AND NON-RESISTANCE.

An excellent brother in Wilmington, Ohio, has forwarded an article under this caption, in vindication of his views from certain imputations

which he supposes alleged against them by some remarks from brother Winans in a late Harbinger. He regards his views as both misconceived and misrepresented by brother Winans. Not desiring any controversy between these good brethren on this subject, I defer this article for the time being. As he was not named, but only alluded to, as he supposes, in said article, he will not of course feel himself injured by not being heasd in defence against mere presumptive opposition to his sentiments. Our brother of Wilmington believes that magistrates ought to be obeyed in all things not impairing liberty of conscience or a proper regard to the authority of the Lord, both of magistrates and the man's conscience, A. C.

A JEW'S OPINION OF CHRIST.

The press has not, during this century, produced a more remarkable piece than the following, from the pen of *Mordecai M. Noah*, the most influential Jew in America, and perhaps as highly esteemed as any of that people elsewhere. This honorable testimony comes from the most sagacious organ of the most wily foes Christianity ever had. It is the opinion of the politician and the philanthropist. It is the opinion of one who, from his circumstances, knows more of the whole subject than Hume, Voltaire, Volney, Paine, D'Alembert, Mirabaud, Spinoza, Chesterfield, Gibbon, or any other sceptic or infidel ever did, or ever could know. The Jew is nationally and religiously, and from his birth, an unbeliever in Christ; and, at the same time, he is the only man on earth who can, with any modesty or honesty, deny the facts of the New Testament. All the ancient Jews admitted all the miracles reported of Jesus, except his resurrection; and now the modern Jew does not admit, but asserts them. I thank my God that this Israelite has lifted his pen upon the subject of Christ! It must excite the sympathies of every feeling person to see what pains Mr. Noah is at to exculpate his nation from the guilt of our Saviour's crucifixion. He lays the sin, and very justly, to the charge of the monster Pontius Pilate. *Christian Preacher.*

TESTIMONY OF MORDECAI M. NOAH.

Jesus of Nazareth, considered as a man, and not in a spiritual sense, was a reformer. He appeared at a time when the Jewish nation were encompassed by troubles—divided among themselves—their country in the power of the Romans, and their energies almost broken down by grief and vexation. Calamity and internal dissensions made them suspicious and distrustful—their tempers soured and their strict sense of justice blunted by accumulated misfortune. In this position Jesus found them, and preached reformation—he denounced men in high places—he pointed out what he conceived to be violations and evasions of the laws—he mingled temporal and spiritual affairs—spoke as the vicegerent of the highest power—and by miracles, prophecies, moral

doctrines, great self-denials and meekness, drew around him followers or disciples of character, firmness, and ability, who created great alarm among the Priesthood, and they determined to get rid of him. He was not tried or condemned strictly under the Mosaic laws. His arrest was in the night, and consequently illegal; and the trial and condemnation were not in strict conformity to the laws. We look upon these events in these free and enlightened times with the eye of philosophy and a predominating love of truth. No one can read the trial of Jesus of Nazareth, without coming to the conclusion that he was sacrificed, not by the Jews, but by Pontius Pilate, the Roman governor, who had the power of condemning to death. He was accused by the people, and some of the Jewish people; but the proofs of this accusation Pilate himself pronounced untenable and void; and even after Jesus had refused to defend himself, he would have dismissed the case had he not been taunted with the declaration that he was no friend of Cesar's if he allowed Jesus to escape. The love of office, the curse of men even to this day, overcame his love of justice, and he, cowardly and treacherously, handed him over himself to execution. Caiphas the High Priest said "it was expedient that one man should die for the people;" and the truth is, that the death of Jesus, occurring at the time it did, preserved the nation to this day. Persecution unites—while toleration weakens. United by the common ties of misfortune, they are more numerous and potent, at this moment, in their dispersion, than they were in the most glorious days of the reign of Solomon. Equally important and beneficial was this death of Jesus to the civilized world—it gave that world a liberal and enlightened religion—obscure and misunderstood in its progress; but, since the Reformation, coming out bright and intellectual. The Jews never should have suffered for the agency they had in the death of Jesus of Nazareth. If he was the Son of God, then the Jews were mere instruments in the hands of a higher power to bring about the inscrutable decrees of divine Providence. If he was a man, with all man's sins and frailties, who would not have died ten thousand deaths to bring about the great moral reform which has resulted to the world from that sacrifice!

CONVERSION OF THE JEWS.

The Rev. Mr. Frey, the converted Jew, who has lately returned to this country after an absence of nearly three years, writes thus to the editor of the Baptist Register:—"I have learned that no less than three thousand of my Jewish brethren have made a public profession of faith in our Lord and Saviour, during the last twenty-five years, and forty-three of my Jewish brethren are now preaching 'the glorious gospel of the blessed God.' " *Christian Index.*

THE STUDY OF CHRIST CRUCIFIED.

Christ crucified is the library which triumphant souls will be studying to all eternity. This is the only library the study of which cures all its maladies and distempers. Other knowledge makes men's

minds giddy and flatulent; this settles and composes them. Other knowledge is apt to swell into high conceits and opinions of themselves; this brings them to the truest view of themselves, and thereby to humility and sobriety. Other knowledge leaves men's minds as it found them: this alters them and makes them better. So transcendant an excellency is there in the knowledge of Christ crucified, above the sublimest speculations in the world.—*Bishop Stillingfleet.*

BLUE STOCKINGS.

The appellation of "Blue Stocking" is understood to have originated in the dress of old Bishop Stillingfleet, (grandson of the Bishop,) as he used to appear in the parties of Mrs. Montague, in Portman Square, London. He was jilted by a mistress, to whose remembrance he remained faithful; and in spite of a disappointment which he then deeply felt, remained to the last one of the most amiable of men and entertaining of companions. Mr. Stillingfleet almost always wore blue worsted stockings, and whenever he was absent from Mrs. Montague's evening parties, as his conversation was very entertaining, the company used to say, "We can do nothing without the *blue stockings*," and by degrees the assemblies were called "*blue stocking* clubs," and learned people *blue stockings*. *Oxford Herald.*

LUTHER'S DESCENDANTS.

At a recent celebration of the anniversary of the Reformation, the city of Berlin voted a donation of five hundred crowns to each of the five descendants of Luther, now residiug at Erfurth. A descendant of the brother of Luther, a clergyman, was present at Berlin during the celebration.

DREADFUL CONDITION OF SOCIETY IN LISBON.

From an official return, published in the Diario, it appears that during the months of April, May, and June, of 1838, two thousand seven hundred and seventy-eight crimes were known to have been committed in Lisbon, of which three hundred and thirty-three were assassinations!

GREAT EARTHQUAKE.

A letter from Elder E. Kincaid, Baptist Missionary at Burma, is published in the New York papers. It gives an account of a most dreadful earthquake on the 23d of March, by which the great cities of Ava, Umerapora, Sagaing, Brome, Pomee, and several others, were destroyed. The destruction of life was immense. From Prome to the borders of China, more than 600 miles north and south, embracing the most populous part of the Burman Empire, not a single pagoda, temple, or brick building was left standing. How far the earthquake extended into China is not known. *Louisville Journal.*

From the Portland (Maine) Transcript.

THE EVENING HYMN.

Softly steals the fading light
Down the chambers of the West;
Sweetly doth the shade invite
From our cares and toil to rest.

Radiant with smiles of love
Gently beams the evening star,
From her azure home above,
O'er the dimming landscape far.

Nature now, with soothing tone,
Whispers, 'Man, 'tis time for prayer.'
Bow thee with thy God alone,
Pour thy vesper offering there.

Father, hear our evening song,
While we bow to give thee praise,
That our life thou dost prolong,
Lengthening out our fleeting days.

Father, guide us while the night
Darkly round her course fulfills;
Wake us when the morning light
Smiles above the Eastern hills.

FORGIVENESS.

———How beautifully falls
From human lips that blessed word—*Forgive!*
Forgiveness—'tis the attribute of God—
The sound which openeth heaven—renews again
On earth lost Eden's faded bloom, and flings
Hope's halcyon halo o'er the waste of life
Thrice happy he whose heart has been so schooled
In the meek lessons of humility,
That he can give it utterance: it imparts
Celestial grandeur to the human soul,
And maketh man an angel.

Museum.

DEBATE ON UNIVERSALISM.

It may be seen on page 377, vol. III., new series, that I tendered my right of publication of said discussion, in the form of a separate volume, to Mr. Skinner; expecting, in case of his refusal, a similar tender from him. After so long a time—after the failure of various projects to have me to become a partner in the undertaking, resolved as I was that he or I should publish it on our individual responsibility, Mr. Skinner has issued his proposals for its republication in a volume of from 400 to 500 pages 12mo., neatly bound, at One Dollar. Those paying for five copies shall have a sixth gratis. It is to contain, besides our letters, those of *Spencer* and Montgomery I hope it will be faithfully printed and freely circulated, especially amongst Universalists.

☞ Subscriptions and orders will be received at this Office. A. C.

☞ The YOUNG LADIES' MUSEUM, edited by the Young Ladies of the *Female Collegiate Institute*, Georgetown, Ky. Price, One Dollar per annum, in advance. Subscriptions received at this office.

NOTICE TO THE BRETHREN IN KENTUCKY.

All the churches of Christ in Kentucky, built upon the Bible alone, are earnestly requested to send Messengers to a great meeting to be held in Harrodsburg, Ky., on the Thursday preceding the third Lord's day in May next—to confer together on the great subjects connected with the cause of our blessed Lord and Master It is confidently hoped that all the churches will be represented in this meeting. Our preaching brethren and friends from other states are also requested to make us a visit at that time.

[By request of many preaching brethren and the church of Christ in Harrodsburg.]

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

NEW SERIES.

VOLUME IV.——NUMBER IV.

BETHANY, VA. *APRIL*, 1840.

THOUGHTS ON EVIDENCE—*No. V.*

Brother Campbell,

TAKING it for granted that you have too much firmness to be alarmed by any of the hobgoblins conjured up in my last, I proceed to notice some other cases of spectral illusion.

Before the time of Nicolai this peculiar affection had not been well described. Justus Moser observed the phantasms of flowers; and Nicolai mentions a friend of his own, who occasionally saw, in different colors, circles, squares, and other mathematical figures. But a case has lately occurred which is equally remarkable for the number and variety of the illusions, and for the accuracy and fidelity with which the phenomena have been described.

The eminent Sir David Brewster had occasion a few years ago to spend some days in the society of the lady who was subject to this peculiarity. At that time she had seen no spectral visions; but they had, more than once, formed the subject of conversations in which she seemed to feel the greatest interest. In these conversations Dr. Hibbert's book was mentioned, and Sir David jocularly stated to the lady that if she should ever see an apparition, she might distinguish a genuine ghost, existing externally, from a spectral illusion created by her own mind, by pressing one eye, or straining them both, so as to see objects double, as the *external ghost* would in this case be doubled, while the spectral illusion would remain single.

A few months after this conversation, Sir David was greatly surprized to learn that this lady had herself become the victim of these mental creations. From the 26th of December, 1829, to the 30th April, 1831, no fewer than thirteen cases of spectral illusion occurred

to her. *Seven* of these happened when she was alone; *four* when she was with her husband, and *two* when she was in the company of friends. Minute accounts of all these are given by Sir David Brewster, from the communications of the lady's husband, who appears to be one of his personal friends; and of whom he says, that if it were permitted to mention his name, his rank in society and his eminence in the scientific world would satisfy the most sceptical reader, that the case has been philosophically as well as faithfully described. The lady, he says, from her previous knowledge of the subject, watched her own case from the commencement, as one of spectral illusion, and she was never induced to misinterpret her perceptions by any superstitious fear, or to exaggerate them by any love of the marvellous. The phenomena, therefore, which she saw and described, have all the attributes of scientific facts, which the philosopher may employ with confidence in his researches

1st. The first illusion which Mrs. A. experienced affected only the ear. On the 26th of December, 1809, when she was standing near the fire in the hall, and on the point of going to dress for dinner, she heard her husband's voice calling her by name, '* * * —, come here, come to me.' She imagined that he was calling to have the door opened; but upon going there she was surprised to find nobody. On her return to the fire, she heard the same voice and the same words very distinctly, and they were repeated a third time in a very loud, plaintive, and somewhat impatient tone. Imagining that Mr. A. was in search of her, she went to her room, and was surprised afterwards to learn, upon his return to the house, half an hour afterwards, that the whole was an illusion.

2d. On the 30th of the same month, when Mrs. A. entered the drawing room she saw the figure of her husband standing with his back to the fire. As he had gone out for a walk, half an hour before, she asked him how he had returned so soon. The figure looked fixedly at her with a serious and thoughtful expression of countenance, but was silent. She imagined that Mr. A. was absorbed in thought. She sat down in an arm-chair near the fire, and within two feet of the figure, which still stood before her. As its eyes, however, continued fixed upon her, she said, 'Why don't you speak?' Upon this the figure moved off to the window at the farther end of the room, with its eyes still fixed upon her, and passed so very close to her, that she was struck by the circumstance of hearing no step, nor sound, nor feeling her clothes brushed against, nor any agitation in the air. She then conceived, for the first time, that this was a spectral illusion; and recollecting the experiment which had not long before been suggested to

her, she was on the eve of trying to double her vision, when the figure disappeared at the window. Mrs. A. instantly followed it, shook the curtains, and examined the window, being still unwilling to believe that it was not a reality.

3d. About the 5th of February, 1830, when Mrs. A. was arranging her hair at her dressing-glass, previous to going to bed, she was suddenly startled by seeing, over her left shoulder, in the mirror, the figure of a near relative who was then out of England. It was dressed in grave-clothes, closely pinned round the head and under the chin. The eyes were open, and met hers in the glass, but the features were solemn and rigid. After a few minutes she turned round to look for the reality over her shoulder, but it was not to be seen, and had also disappeared from the mirror. Mrs. A. felt herself at this time listless and drowsy from having taken a fatiguing drive during the day, and she describes herself as feeling a sort of fascination which at first compelled her to gaze on this melancholy apparition.

4th. On the 17th of March, when Mrs. A. had dismissed her maid previous to going to bed, and was sitting with her feet in hot water, repeating a striking passage which she had read during the day, she perceived, in a large easy chair before her, the figure of a departed friend, her own sister-in-law. The figure was dressed with great neatness, as was usual with her, but in a gown of a peculiar kind, such as Mrs. A. had never seen her wear, but exactly such as had been described to her by a common friend, as having been worn by her sister-in-law during her last visit to England. She noticed particularly the dress, air, and appearance of the figure, which sat in an easy attitude with a handkerchief in one hand. She felt a difficulty when she tried to speak to her, and in about three minutes it disappeared. Mr. A. entered the room about a minute afterwards, and found his lady slightly nervous, but fully aware of the nature of the apparition. She experienced, on this occasion, a peculiar sensation in the eyes, which seemed to be relieved when the vision was over.

5th. Eight months passed away before Mrs. A. saw any other apparition. On the 5th of October, between 1 and 2 in the morning, she awoke her husband to tell him that she had just seen the figure of his deceased mother draw aside the bed curtains, and appear between them, in the same dress in which Mrs. A. had seen her for the last time in Paris, in 1824.

6th. The next apparition which she saw presented itself in her own drawing room, in the midst of a circle of her friends. On the 11th of October, the figure of a deceased friend appeared to be moving towards her from the window at the farther end of the room. It approached

the fire place and sat down in a chair opposite to that which Mrs. A. occupied. The prevailing sentiment in her mind was a fear that the company should observe her staring at vacancy in the way she was conscious of doing, and should suppose her to be deranged. Under this fear, and recollecting a story of a similar effect in Sir Walter Scott's work on Demonology, which she had lately read, she summoned up resolution to seat herself on the chair occupied by the figure. The apparition remained perfectly dintinct till she sat down, as if in its lap, when it disappeared.

Omitting the other cases which occurred to this lady, we will add two or three observations which she made on these phenomena and on the state of her feelings at the time. 1st. Some of the spectres were seen in bright day-light, and she confidently states that they were as vivid as the reality, and had all the brightness of coloring which characterizes external objects. 2d. The first apparition of her husband concealed the real objects behind it. 3d. She experienced a sort of fascination which compelled her to gaze on the apparitions. 4th. A peculiar expression of eyes and countenance prevailed during the continuance of the illusions. 5th. A peculiar feeling in the eyes preceded them for some hours. 6th. She could discover no connexion between them and any previous train of thought.'

Although the interesting nature of the subject would induce me to present many other cases, I presume that the preceding will be sufficient to enable the reader to comprehend the explanation of these phenomena. It is this: There is in these cases a vascular fulness either of that nervous expansion in the back of the eye, called the retina, upon which all images of external objects are painted, or of that portion of the brain which is immediately concerned in the functions of the eye. This vascular fulness, however, is itself of a secondary or sympathetic character, and is found to be dependent upon a peculiar condition of the stomach and other *digestive organs*. Both Nicolai and Mrs. A. were subject to this affection of the digestive organs. In the former it occasioned giddiness, and in the latter a sense of fulness in the head. In proportion as it increases, the spectral illusions increased also, and the remedies addressed to the former, removed the latter. Indeed the true seat and nature of this affection is now so perfectly understood, that it is treated with as much confidence and success as any other case whatever.'

But what will at first appear curious about it is, that the apparition is really and truly *painted upon the retina by the reverse action of the mind.* The same is the case in occular spectra produced by the action of a strong light upon the eye. Sir Isaac Newton could even transfer

the impression from one eye to the other, and they may be revived for months by the action of the imagination. Spectres which are *seen* and have a position in front of the eye, must be seen by the exercise of ocular functions—must be impressed upon the retina, that part of the organ of vision which can alone receive images, or give to them an external existence. The retina is susceptible of impressions both from within and from without: from within, through memory or imagination, as every one experiences in that state between sleeping and waking, when the scenes of youth, or the most fantastic appearances present themselves: and from without, by means of external objects. In a state of perfect health the ideas or images of memory and imagination are feeble compared with those of sensation. But in that peculiar state of the system upon which spectral illusions depend, the mental delineations acquire superior force and vividness for a time, but soon give way again to the dominion of surrounding impressions.

A very singular case of spectral illusion was communicated to Dr. Abercrombie, which confirms the above view of the subject in every particular. I shall not, however, trespass upon the patience of the reader by relating it. Dr. Abernethy mentions several cases which fell under his observation. One of these I will briefly narrate. A gentlemen of education and high standing in London was one day seated in his library, engaged in reading. Upon raising his eyes, he saw a little old woman in a scarlet cloak, sitting in a chair a few steps from him. He immediately addressed her, "Woman, what do you want? How did you come here?" Receiving no answer, he repeated his questions. The figure remained silent. He then rung the bell. A servant entered. "Show that woman down stairs." The servant looked about the room in surprise, and assured his master that there was no woman present. "Then, sir," said he, at once aware of the nature of the affection, "go for my physician."

It clearly appears, then, that the senses of seeing and hearing, and more particularly the former, upon which we are wont to rely with so much confidence, are subject to be affected in such a way as to deceive and mislead: and this too while the person is even in tolerable health; for the affection upon which spectral illusions depend, is not of a grave or sincere character, the person laboring under it being still able to attend to his regular business. So bright and vivid are these delusive images, that it is only persons of accurate powers of observation who can distinguish them from realities. Who can tell how many such cases occur which are supposed to be actual perceptions, and are made the foundation of religious faith and experience? Certain it is that we hear many such relations upon which more reliance is placed than

upon the testimony of the twelve Apostles. Certain it is too, that the hearing of loud and long-continued addresses, the attendance upon protracted meetings, the disturbed rest, the irregular and often unsuitable meals, the light, motion, and concourse with which persons are surrounded on such occasions, are precisely adapted to produce, especially in persons of a nervous or imaginative temperament, that very state of the digestive organs and of the mind which give rise to such illusions. With respect to those, however, whose minds are enlightened by science, we have seen that the testimony of even a single witness has been, in such cases, sufficient to convince them contrary to the evidence of their own senses. R. R.

PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE.

W—— M——, June 18, 1838.

Dear Sister—Your letter of the 3d of May is now before me. It reached this in due time, and received a cordial welcome. We were thankful to hear of your health and happiness. We were refreshed in spirit by the sentiments contained in your letter. It is cause of unfeigned thanksgiving that, at so early a period of your life, you should have been enabled to place so just an estimate upon the things of a present world, and to set your heart to seek for imperishable treasures. "They build too low, who build beneath the skies." The tinsel and glare of worldly externals may charm the senses, but they leave the soul to pine and perish. What a stupendous infatuation has the pride and pomp of dress and fashion become in this our favored land? What jealousies, what rivalries have followed in the train? And then to support all this immense extravagance, what eagerness of pursuit, what avidity to grasp—yea, what fraud and oppression are practised! And the poor, that they may not be wholly put to shame by the rich, how do they labor and "bereave their souls of good," and exert every power to approach as near as *may be* to the external show of the rich! Upon the whole, what a world of confusion and wickedness—of sin and strife—of sorrow and disappointment, is this world of ours!

"Oh! who could bear life's stormy doom
Did not thy wing of love
Come brightly wafting through the gloom,
Our peace-branch from above!"

What is there upon this impure earth that has attraction for the "pure in heart"? "Vanity and lies" is a sentence written on every earthly possession; but the inscription is concealed from the people of the world. The glories of eternity are hidden from their view by the god of this world, and a splendid illusion is set before them.

"Thus in the desert's dreary waste,
By magic power produced in haste,
As old romances say,

Castles, and groves, and music sweet.
The senses of the trav'ler cheat
And stop him in his way;

But while he gazes with surprise,
The charm dissolves, the vision dies;
'Twas but enchanted ground;
Thus if the Lord our spirit touch,
The world, which promis'd us so much,
A wilderness is found!"

When the Lord anoints our eyes with eye-salve, we are enabled to descry the glories of "the better land," and we long "to fly away and be at rest." Jesus has ravished our souls with his charms, and we have found rest in his embrace—that rest for which we sighed in vain in the pursuit of worldly happiness. We have found that rest typified by the Hebrew Sabbath which that people enjoyed during the toils and dangers of their wilderness journey. "Come unto me, all you that labor, and are heavy laden," says Christ, "and I will give you rest." And Paul affirms, "We who have believed *do enter* into rest." "Christ died for all, that they who live (by his death) should not henceforth live unto themselves; but unto him who died for them and rose again." Here, then, our own wills *cease* to actuate us: we cease to be governed by our own passions and inclinations; "for he that has entered into his rest hath ceased from *his own works* as God did from his." But if our heavenly Father thus requires us to do *his works* and *his pleasure*, he also on his part graciously pledges himself for our sustenance and well being: himself hath said, "I will never leave thee nor forsake thee." Thus it is, as one has said, "Faith becomes the grave of care." "Cast thy burden upon the Lord and he will sustain thee," is an antidote for all the perplexities and solicitudes of life. Are we afraid of hunger and nakedness? We are taught to remember the fowls which are fed, and the grass which is clothed by the care of our heavenly Father. Are we poor and needy? We hear his cheering voice, "Hath not God chosen the poor of this world rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom that he hath prepared for them that love him." Have we an ambition that aims at lofty things? We hear his animating voice, "The conquerer shall inherit all things." "He that overcometh will I grant to sit down with me on my throne, even as I have overcome and am set down with my Father on his throne." Are we persecuted, insulted, contemned? He tells us, "Be not troubled;" he will assert our dignity; he will redress our grievances; he will avenge our cause: "Vengeance is mine—I will repay, saith the Lord." How glorious is that divine influence which provides for our souls such rest here, and for all who will enjoy this rest here has provided an eternity of bliss in heaven.

"Astonishing beyond astonishment!
A heaven bestow'd for heaven enjoy'd!"

Mrs. C. joins me in Christian love to yourself and mother. Pray for us as we do for you, that we may be kept in the love of God unto eternal life. Yours in the Lord,

M. S. C.

W——, July 18, 1838.

Mr. C——,

Many thanks for your last letter, which came to hand a short time since.

We were sorry to hear that ill health had prevented our seeing yourself with Mrs. C—— and Mr. C——, as we had anticipated, in June. I trust nothing will occur to prevent the contemplated visit to the Lake in August. We shall be most happy to see you in W——. I am most anxious to become personally acquainted with Mrs. C——, who is now much loved by me. With what unspeakable joy does the Christian look forward to that glorious day, when "the whole family in heaven and upon earth" shall be assembled together in "one fold, having one Shepherd;" all being "like him" who is "full of grace and truth." Surely,

> "A hope so great and so divine
> May trials well endure,
> And purify our souls from sin
> As Christ himself is pure."

It is now about two weeks since my dear father and mother left for C——. Mother's health was far from being good when she left, having scarcely recovered from a severe illness which confined her to her bed some weeks. She wrote, however, from P—— that she gained strength from journeying, and we hope the result will be her entire restoration to health.

There have recently been three very interesting meetings on the Western Reserve. Twenty-nine persons were immersed at the different places.

I have much time for reading this summer, nearly all of which is occupied in the study of the Holy Scriptures. I have spent so great a portion of my life, comparatively short though it may be, in the neglect of this blessed volume, or (what is nearly the same, as to receiving any benefit from it,) have read it in such an improper and injudicious manner, that I am daily astonished at my ignorance of its contents. I have been so much in the habit of reading the Bible differently from any other book in the world, without paying any attention to its connexion one part with another; even in one of the New Testament epistles, reading a chapter here and there without any regard to the circumstances when, by whom, or for what purpose it was written; that, although I was pretty well acquainted with the *words*, I had clear ideas of the true meaning and spirit of but a small portion of it. The *new translation* of the New Testament I find a most excellent assistant in understanding many hitherto dark passages, and in giving a more clear idea of what I before imagined I understood: indeed, making the whole, generally speaking, more intelligible than the old. How much are those persons to be pitied, who, from blind prejudice, refuse to read this translation, and thus deprive themselves of so much pure enjoyment. "The entrance of thy word giveth light; it giveth understanding to the simple."

Yours in the hope of eternal life,

S. H. K.

W—— M——, September.

Dear Sister—I owe you an apology for not writing sooner; but we live under a dispensation of grace, so I expect to be forgiven. We are all well, except my beloved wife; she is not quite so well as usual.

I was yesterday discoursing upon an old subject, and to many altogether stale; yet to the Christian it will be always new. It was the excellence of the holy scriptures. Regarding them simply in the light of an inheritance, how strongly contrasted are they with the wealth, the honors, and the pleasures of this life. Let us consider them in five essential points: First, the certainty of the attainment; second, the certainty of possession when obtained; third, the power to satisfy the desire; fourth, the value of the possession; and fifth, its duration. As to every thing beneath the sun, how uncertain is the attainment; and when attained, how uncertain is the tenure by which it is held. The tempest, the earthquake, the lightning from heaven, and "the pestilence which walketh in darkness" may destroy our possessions, blast our hopes, and scatter away our friends, and leave us to mourn and weep. And while possessed, how unsatisfactory are all earthly possessions and pleasures!

"And could we call all Europe ours,
With India and Peru
The mind would feel an aching void,
And still want something new."

"Is this all," exclaimed Cesar in disappointment and disgust, when he had attained the summit of his ambition. Indeed, it has passed into an adage, "Possession is the *bane* of enjoyment." Those bright prospects which glittered before us like the sunbeams dancing upon the waters at a distance, have, upon a near approach, suddenly assumed a leaden hue, without life or beauty. It is well said by the humorist Burns, (who could also be sentimental and religious at times,)

"Pleasures are like poppies spread.
You seize the flowe'—its bloom is shed;
Or, like the snow-drop in the river,
A moment white, then gone forever;
Or like the borealis race
That flit ere you can point their place;
Or like the rainbow's lovely form
Evanishing amid the storm."

And as to value, "what shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" And as to duration, "the world passeth away." But the *treasures* of grace in the scriptures, they are first of all—sure to all who seek. "Seek and you shall find." And second, they are sure to the possessor. "Your joy no man taketh from you," said Jesus to his disciples. "We have received a kingdom which cannot be moved." It can only be lost by our own voluntary resignation; for, says Paul, "I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor any *created thing* shall be able to separate us from the love of God." But thirdly, it satisfies the desires: "My soul shall be *satisfied* as with marrow and fatness," says David; and heavenly wisdom says, "I lead in the way of righteousness, in the midst of the paths of judgment, that I may cause those

that love me to inherit *substance*, and I will *fill* their treasures." "O! that thou hadst hearkened to my commandments, then had thy peace been as a river." And as to value, the Psalmist says, "I have rejoiced in the way of thy holiness above all riches" And again, "Therefore, I love thy commandments above gold; yea, above fine gold." "More to be desired are they than gold; yea, than *much* fine gold: sweeter also than honey and the honey-comb." And of the wisdom contained in this word Job says, "The gold and the crystal cannot equal it; and the exchange of it shall not be for jewels of fine gold. No mention shall be made of coral or pearls; for the price of wisdom is above rubies." And of duration the Psalmist says, "Thy testimonies have I taken as my heritage *forever;*" yea, "all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass: the grass withereth and the flower thereof falleth away; but the *word* of the Lord endureth *forever*." O! how is this blessed word neglected and contemned and blasphemed by the children of men! Even professing Christians, how do they revile the word of the Lord, calling it "a dead letter;" yet the Apostle says "it is *living* and powerful." David says, "The Lord hath magnified his *word* above all his name:" yet how many are there who think to *honor* the Lord by *degrading* his word! Strange, indeed!! Do not we say, "What is a *man* but his word." Solomon says, "Where the *word* of a king is there is power:" but Christians say, Where the *word* of the omnipotent Jehovah is there is *no power!!* How will those who have thus blasphemed the word of the Lord stand before him in the judgment? Where will those teachers appear who have "thus turned away the ears of the people from the truth, and turned them to fables" O! let us meditate on "the law of the Lord by day and by night." "Let us hide his word in our hearts that we may not sin against him." Let us bind his precepts upon our hearts, and take them as our everlasting heritage.—Farewell. C.

S——, November 38, 1838.

Dear brother—Your letter of October is now before me, and notwithstanding my long delay in answering it, I trust you will believe me when I tell you it has been read and re-read many times with much satisfaction. It arrived a short time before I left my dear home, and mother advised me to wait until my arrival here before I answered it.

I have now been nearly three weeks under the instruction of Mrs. O——, Principal of the E—— Seminary; and although at times I mourn for my dear home, and almost wish myself back again with the precious family circle, where I am surrounded by beloved Christian friends, still I trust I shall be both *mentally* and morally improved, and see no cause hereafter to regret my temporary absence from the dearest spot to me on all the earth. Mrs. O—— is a member of the Presbyterian church, and an eminently pious woman. The study of the scriptures occupies no small portion of our time. When Mrs. O—— asked me to what denomination I belonged, I replied, "I am a disciple." At this she seemed rather surprised, and she has since told me that she had never heard of our church before; but the reply was not lost upon her, for she thought it the most appropriate name by

which a Christian could be known. She seems to be a very liberal-minded lady, and has expressed herself as much pleased with many things which I have told her with regard to our taking the Bible as our only "creed," and the views which we had consequently been led to adopt. The teachers are many of them pious, and a good influence seems to pervade the school; though none of the pupils, with the single exception of myself, are professedly Christians. I sometimes feel so sensibly the danger there is of my conduct causing the "way of truth to be evil spoken of," that it makes me very sad. I think much of the privileges of which I am deprived on each returning "first day," and long to meet with the dear congregation of disciples in W——; but though I am separated from them in body, I am often with them in spirit, and I delight to remember them in love before a throne of grace; and the consideration that God is not confined to temples made with hands, never fails to give me comfort.

I am truly sorry to hear of dear Mrs. C——'s continued ill health. I hope the next intelligence from her will be restoration to her former health.

This letter has been written amidst the confusion of the school-room, and I trust you will excuse all inaccuracies; and let me ask as a special favor that you will not follow my example, but write very soon. A letter from you, now that I am away from home, and far from the friends I love, would be doubly valuable. I trust I am not forgotten in your prayers. Please give my best love to Mrs. C——.

Hoping to hear from you soon, I remain yours in Christian hope,

S. H. K.

NEW INSTITUTION—*No. III.*

The following notice of a great benefactor of men, and of his views of Education, we extract from "*The Albion*," a recent number of which has been forwarded us by a friend in Cincinnati. We see so much in this sketch in harmony with our views of the theory and practice of education, and so much good sense on the whole subject on which he writes, that we gladly offer a few passages to our readers.

A. C.

WHAT DE FELLENBERG HAS DONE FOR EDUCATION.

This is a little book, but the subject of which it treats is the greatest which can occupy the attention of civilized man. This subject is education, in its widest and highest sense, including moral training, as also the art of bettering the physical condition of the poor, by teaching them practically and theoretically the great science of agriculture. We believe that while preserving the secrecy of the name, we may state that the volume has been published under the auspices of a person not less distinguished by rank than an ardent philanthropy, and a generous anxiety for all that tends to promote the morals and well-being of society. It is sad to reflect how little has been done in

England to direct attention to the important experiments that have been long in progress in Switzerland. In our own reading we have scarcely met with any thing (in English) about De Fellenberg and his institutions, except a short article in the "Penny Magazine," one or two articles in the "Quarterly Journal of Education," and a small pamphlet by Mr. Duppa.

Besides an admirable sketch of what De Fellenberg has really done, the pages before us contain a lucid view of the history of education and society in Europe at large. Our inclination would lead us to a long essay upon these important topics, but we have neither time nor space to indulge it; and, after all, we doubt whether we could say any thing so good as is here said by our author. We shall, therefore, simply extract a few passages to convey some notion of a little book, which we most earnestly recommend to the attention of all who have heads capable of thinking and hearts capable of feeling for their fellow-men—and especially to the study of all who are aware of the necessity of reforming education, of which we may now say, even as Milton said in his days, that this is "one of the greatest and noblest designs that can be thought on, and for the want whereof the nation perishes."

In the following passage the merits of De Fellenberg, and the demerits and criminal apathy of governments in general, are not overrated:—

"The name of De Fellenberg is familiar to all the civilized nations of Europe and North America, and may now be mentioned without offence. This expression implies that it once was otherwise. Yes, the age in which he has lived having been one of political storms, every name which was eminent enough to appear above the surface of the troubled waters was claimed or denounced by a party; none could escape. Even those who disclaimed all party, but who, from the highest motives, thought they were bound not to live for themselves alone, nor to hide their talent in a napkin; but to labor, like the holy men of old, according to the light given them, for the permanent good of their fellow-creatures, were exposed to a moral martyrdom, from the ignorance, misconception, and hostility of their contemporaries.

"Schools and education had certainly been heard of from the times of Rome and Greece—had not been totally destroyed at the fall of the Empire—and had in a degree revived with the revival of learning; but the kind of education which Fellenberg contemplated, with its application to the lowest as well as the highest class of society, was so new, that it is still a novelty in enlightened England, after his forty years' experimental labors at Hotwyl. The great object to which he had determined to devote his life was the practical solution of the question, Whether it is possible to influence and form the human character by early discipline and instruction; to set the motives, feelings, and passions in a proper course; to fix in the mind moral and religious principles, giving rise to corresponding habits of action; to store the mind with just ideas, and the heart with Christian sentiments. He wished to raise the school from a mere technical system to one of intelligence; and from a place of irksome constraint to one of pleasing and beneficial occupations.

"As these objects had never been attained, nor even attempted, with a direct, specific, and undivided purpose, Fellenberg's wise and bene-

volent plans for the improvement of character were looked at as dangerous innovations in the usual mode of bringing up the young, and as connected with some deep secret plot for the subversion of society. He had therefore to contend, during many years, with a combination of ignorance, prejudice, and, we fear we must add, in some instances, of malignity. Before his time, almost the only medium of instruction for the people was the pulpit; almost the only means of discipline, of training and forming character, were domestic; which domestic training consisted in a short intercourse between parent and child at certain hours of the day, when labor was over; and in permitting the children, during the rest of the day, to wander at large in the streets of towns, or the fields of the country, encouraging each other to vice and impiety. It was this pernicious training which Fellenberg proposed to supersede by one of order, method, and discipline; to put useful employment in the place of mischievous idleness, and hourly Christian instruction and superintendence in the place of total neglect and ignorance. Was such a scheme feasible? and if so, would it not be better and more Christian than the former state of things?

"We have said that parents, as soon as society passes from the barbarous state to the pursuit of arts, are totally incompetent to educate their own children, and that the artificial education of the school must commence. This is true of all classes of society, as well as of the lowest. Education becomes an art, as well as the manufacture of articles of consumption. It becomes subject to the law of the division of labor; and they who engage in it will excel in it by the same necessity that a mechanic excels in his peculiar occupation. Upon this principle schools become necessary for all classes, to supply the want of time, attention, and knowledge in parents of all ranks. If mankind had been capable of anticipating and foreseeing their own wants before they were pressed upon them by a painful experience, schools and schoolmasters would have been coeval with the first transition from a state of barbarian war to one of incipient civilization and the cultivation of the arts. But man cannot foresee, and can only learn by pain and sorrow how to obviate the recurrence of similar suffering. The formation of character by means of schools—i. e. by means of systematic discipline and instruction, is a new thought. Schools were first established for other purposes; and when established, the formation of character was not an element in their system, nor is it so yet. Schools were established for the sake of mere knowledge; for cultivating the intellect, not the heart. The progress of society required a certain number of persons who could read and write, in order to fill, in church and state, certain offices which had sprung up from the necessities of society; and it was long before these necessities were really supplied. Of those who were thus educated, some turned their attention to literature and general knowledge, and thus opened a new field for the employment of the human mind—a field of mere abstract knowledge and speculation, totally unconnected with practical purposes."

The cardinal thought in this scheme is our *beau ideal* of education, viz.—*that the formation of moral character, the culture of the heart*, is the supreme end of education, or rather is education itself. With me *education* and *the formation of moral character* are identical expressions.

An immoral man is uneducated. The blasphemer, the profane swearer, the liar, the calumniator, the duellist, the braggadocia, the peculator, &c. &c. are vulgar, barbarous, and uneducated persons. But such is not the popular opinion. Why? Because, as De Fellenberg avers, "the formation of character by means of schools—i. e. by means of systematic discipline and instruction, is a new thought. Schools were first established for other purposes; and when established, the formation of character was not an element in their system—*nor is it so yet.*" This statement, which certainly is true, deserves the gravest reflections of the gravest men; and is, to my mind, a justifiable reason—an imperious demand for the *new institution* to which we are calling the attention of Christians and philanthropists of every name. We contemplate a scheme in which the formation of the physical and intellectual man shall not be neglected, but which shall be always held in subordination to the moral man. In which, in one word, the formation of moral character, the cultivation of the heart, shall be the Alpha and the Omega, the radical, regulating, and all-controlling aim and object in all the literary and scientific studies, in all the exercises, recreations and amusements of children and youth. A. C.

THE FEAST OF PENTECOST.

The precise intention of this feast is not so easy to determine. The name itself means nothing more than "the fiftieth." It was fifty days from the offering of the "first ripe sheaf," which is by universal consent admitted to have been the first day of the week immediately after the feast of the Passover. "And ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the Sabbath, from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave-offering; seven Sabbaths shall ye complete. Even unto the morrow after the seventh shall ye number fifty days, and ye shall offer a new meat-offering unto the Lord:" see Lev. xxiii. 15, 16; also, Deut. xvi. 9. Some suppose that this fiftieth day was a day of devout thanksgiving for the consummation of the harvest. Others suppose, with some plausibility, that it commemorated the giving of the *law*. If there be any *positive evidence* on the subject I have never been so happy as to find it, although I have searched much. But we pass briefly to notice the construction of

The Tabernacle and the Temple.

When the universe was made by the power of the great Jehovah, contrived by his wisdom, and arranged by his goodness, he pronounced

it "good"—"very good." Then it was, ere sin had defiled his work, that

> "His temple was all space,
> His altar earth, sea, sky."

but when sin had contaminated this fair creation the Most High was pleased to make himself known as a God of "holiness," which word literally signifies "not of the earth," or "separation from the earth;" making the sin-polluted earth identical with sin or defilement. When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance; when he separated the sons of Adam; when he "chose Israel for his portion," and "Jacob for the lot of his inheritance," then it was that he caused to be sanctified, or set apart from the earth, from all that was common, or sinful, or impure, a place to record his name; and graciously assured that people by Moses, "In all places wheresoever I record my name, there will I meet with you, and there will I bless you." Do we inquire into the reason of this? Why should a being who is assuredly every where present have required of his people to erect but one altar, to construct but one tabernacle? I rejoice that the Lord has called us to "reason together" upon all his laws and institutions. He has not required of us "implicit faith" in these things. If the Lord of hosts commanded the people, saying, "Take heed that thou offer not thy burnt offerings and thy sacrifices in every place which thou seest; but in one of thy tribes which the Lord thy God shall choose to set his name, thither shalt thou bring thy burnt offerings and thy sacrifices." The reason of all this is most obvious from the holy scriptures themselves. The heathen nations round about them built altars "on every high hill and under every green tree" (as Israel also did in the days of their apostacy) to the gods they worshipped. Wherever they saw a lofty and beautiful hill, or a fragrant bower, or a wide-spreading tree, there they supposed some deity would take up his abode, and forthwith they would build an altar to the supposed deity. This doubtless explains the otherwise mysterious conduct of Balaam in so often changing his position and building altars in the sight of all the camp of Israel. He well knew if he could but seduce them to idolatry he should bring upon them the curse which he sought. The Most High also commands his people, saying, "Thou shalt not plant thee a grove of any trees near unto the altar of the Lord thy God, which thou shalt make thee." But the Lord immediately subjoins, "Neither shalt thou set thee up any *image* which the Lord thy God hateth." To take away, therefore, all tendencies to idolatry, the "Lord of hosts," the "God of Israel," caused his name to be recorded in *one place*, and thither the tribes were to go to worship. We see how quickly the

"ten tribes" were turned to idolatry when they were persuaded by Jeroboam that they could worship the Lord at Bethel and at Dan as well as at Jerusalem, where the Lord had recorded his name. Thus "they forgot his name for Baal." To this we may have occasion to refer again before we close our series. In the meantime every one can see that all things connected with the temple worship, the temple itself, the "holy place," and the "most holy," were *calculated* to inspire the worshippers with the most sublime moral sentiments and with the most profound veneration for "the High and Holy One who inhabited eternity." But when this temple became *polluted* "the Holy One of Israel" departed from it and went away from his people. We will next proceed to notice

THE INSTITUTION OR ORDINANCE OF FASTING.

When I touch upon this ordinance I would fain clothe it with moral beauty and meaning. Unless this can be done, it is not likely to have many friends or advocates in this epicurean age. We shrug our shoulders and contract our brows at the very mention of the word *fast*. "What need have we, in this age of refinement and light, under a dispensation of grace—a law of liberty, to trouble ourselves with any of the unmeening ceremonies of the "old musty covenant"—that which two thousand years ago was characterized as "that which decayeth and waxeth old, and is ready to vanish away"? But Christianos has no satyrical talent. If he had, the gluttony of the American people, which is proverbial among other nations—their "riotous eating of flesh"—their excessive indulgence of all animal propensities—and, above all, their "*Sabbath-feasting*" as preparatory to "snoring in church" during the whole of "divine service:" all these, I say, would, I think, form a fine subject for a satyrical poem. But "I, no wit, no genius, will" *not* "try."

But to be grave—(and I crave pardon of the reader for an awkward attempt at something for which I was not designed)—I say, to be grave, fasting is an institution of divine appointment, under both the law and the gospel; and I unhesitatingly declare that *no person can enter into the full enjoyment of the Christian religion without occasional—yea, frequent fasting*. The Apostle Paul thus dogmatizes on this subject: "The spirit lusteth against the flesh, and the flesh against the spirit, and these are contrary one to another." But "every generation grows wiser and wiser" is an adage that has become almost sacred—indeed, it is sometimes quoted as scripture. In the plenitude of our wisdom we have discovered that Paul was entirely mistaken—that there is the most perfect harmony between "the flesh and spirit—that James was only an ignorant fisherman," or he never would have

decided that "the world is the enemy of God"—that the Saviour himself was at least most *unphilosophical* in deciding that "no man can serve two masters"—"All these things have we found out by wisdom;" yea, and many more! It is now satisfactorily ascertained that men *can*, not only "serve *two* masters," but *four*—the Lord, the world, the flesh, the devil!!! Under all these circumstances, then, for poor Christianos to attempt to revive the ancient practices of barbarous ages—especially the practice of *fasting*, will, I greatly fear me, be committing as great a *sin* against the wisdom and piety of our enlightened age, as that heretic Luther committed against the good and pious people of his time. Erasmus said of him, (and you know Erasmus was a master of classic literature, and would not say any thing vulgar; besides, it was spoken in a large company, and could not be (I think) impolite. Erasmus said, "Luther has been guilty of two faults: he has touched the *monks* on the *belly*, and the *pope* on the *crown*." But, says the adage, "There is but one step between the sublime and the ridiculous:" the reader will, therefore, pardon me, if I act upon the *presumption* that there is but one step between the *ridiculous* and the *sublime;* since it is a mathematical axiom that "things equal to the same thing are equal to each other.' I will then attempt by this "one step" to ascend to the *sublime;* and now, reader, (brother or sister,) let me show you in "the fear of the Lord," both your *duty* and your *privilege* on this subject. I will consider this subject in a twofold aspect: first, its effect upon the intellect; then upon the moral feelings. That there is a most intimate sympathy between the mind and the body is well understood, and universally admitted. The connexion between the stomach and the brain is so intimate that is has passed into a proverb with physiologists that "he that would have a *clear head* must have a *clear stomach*." Plutarch imputed the uncommon dullness of his countrymen to their excessive eating of swine's flesh. A nation of voluptuaries will always be feeble and dwarfish in intellect. The reason is obvious: the human body is governed by the same great principles that control a pure Christian society—"whether one member suffer all the members suffer with it;" when any part of the mortal frame is pained or oppressed, the sympathies and energies of every other part are called thither to afford relief and condolence. If the stomach be "heavy laden" and "oppressed," it calls all the energies of the whole system, and especially of the *brain*, to its assistance: hence a perfect stupor will always follow a surfeit. Again, if the energies of the mind be called forth in an unusual manner, the brain will make a demand upon the energies of the stomach; and under such circumstances the stomach ought to have but a *light* task assigned it.

To give the stomach its full amount of labor to perform, while the brain is calling off half its energies to its assistance, is as if a task-master should lay upon the shoulders of six men as heavy a burden as they could carry, and then instantly call the half of them to leave their post and engage in something else. Would not those left to sustain the unequal burden sink under it at once? This, I trow, is the reason why so many *students* fall a prey to dyspepsia and consumption. It is *hard eating* rather than "hard studying" that is their ruin! At least their hard studying would do them no harm, if they would *frequently* allow their digestive powers to keep "holiday." The practice of abstinence has long been regarded as imparting great vigor, elasticity, and sagacity to the intellect. It changes entirely the expression of the countenance. The ancient anchorites had a *keen* and piercing expression to the eye that seemed almost *superhuman*. Such men were the foes of tyrants. Thus Cesar speaks of Cassius to his friend Anthony:—

> "Would he were fatter!
> I do not know the man I should avoid
> So soon as that spare Cassius! He reads much;
> He is a great observer, and he looks quite through
> The deeds of men."

CHRISTIANOS.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

REVIEW OF CHRISTIANS AMONG THE SECTS—*No. I.*

CHRISTIANOS and other correspondents have been sailing round the world in quest of a *terra incognita*, some *new found land*, under the broad banner of "Christians among the Sects," until the caption, like the countenance of an old friend, has become quite familiar. Many good things have been said by these three brethren, who, like Job's three friends, as it would seem to me, have erred much more in the application of their premises, than in the premises themselves. It is, indeed, in this jealous and distracted age, difficult to write or speak on positive institutions, without either over-rating or under-rating them according to our prejudices and leanings. And Christianity being, from Alpha to Omega, a positive institution, and a Christian one who is subject to positive precepts; it requires a great deal of logic and much discrimination to make it appear, as our friend Christianos attempts to show, that "a man may be very ignorant of all the Christian ordinances, and yet be in character a Christian—an accepted worshipper of God." p. 589, vol. III. New Series.

There is, too, a great deal less gospel to the "Christians among the sects," in the reasonings of Christianos, than does at first view appear; for while he makes every "*sincere man*" among the sects a Christian in character, if not in state, his *sincere* man is just as hard to find among the sects, according to his definition of him, as a Christian is, in the definitions of such a severe and rectangular logician as Dr. Winans, or in the balancings of such an uncompromising arbitrator as Father Henley.

According to Christianos "a man is as culpable for voluntary ignorance as for wilful disobedience," p. 176; and of course until we know in any given case, whether a sectary's ignorance is wholly involuntary, we cannot receive him as a Christian; and therefore while brother Christianos and brethren Winans and Henley are theoretically or verbally different, they are practically the same. I have no doubt but they will find in any given time and district as many Christians among the sects as he will find *sincere* men, according to their respective definitions.

Christianos, however, has this advantage, that his theory is much more consolatory than that of his brethren; for although it may be very hard for him to find his sincere man whose ignorance is wholly involuntary, he can easily imagine there are many myriads of such persons known to him that knows the heart, while unknown to every one else.

He reasons too much, however, from such passages as these: "It is accepted according to what a man hath, and not according to what a man has not." This will do very well when a man can examine his purse even to a farthing; but as every Christian has his Bible, and cannot so easily say what he has not, it will be rather difficult to find an excuse for his ignorance in "what he has not"—whether the lack may be in sense or in honesty. Those sincere persons, however, who either have no Bible, or who could not read one if they had it, may, indeed, draw much consolation from such general maxims; but for others there is not so much gospel in them.

"Other sheep I have which are not of this fold"—"From the rising of the sun to the going down of the same my name shall be great among the Gentiles," &c.—"Master, we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and we forbade him because he follows not us. And Jesus said, Forbid him not," &c. are not legitimate premises in a controversy about Christians among the sects. They were not spoken in reference to such a question, nor to such a singular predicament as that in which we now find the Christian profession.

It is, however, true that the state of the heart is every thing—is the all in all in the scriptures;" but the question whether the proper state

of the heart can be formed without the ordinances of the gospel, has neither been propounded nor discussed. That a proper state to receive them may be superinduced antecedent to them is not to be disputed; but that such a state of the heart is exactly the Christian state, is quite another theme.

Christianos, it is true, affirms that "not one of the ordinances is absolutely essential to spiritual life;" p. 589. But what of that! Spiritual life is neither Christian state nor character, and was possessed as fully by Melchisedec, Moses, and John the Baptist, as by the Apostle Paul. The whole difficulty seems to me to consist in an unwarrantable use of words. And in this case, as in a thousand others, if the terms were all fully explained the controversy would cease. The word *Christian* has three distinct acceptations in modern times. It has a national, a sectarian, and a scriptural meaning. Nationally it means one that is not a Jew, a Mahometan, a Pagan, an Infidel, but a professor of the Christian faith. In the style of the sects it means something more and something better than a Romanist, a Churchman, a Presbyterian, a Baptist, a Methodist, &c. &c. It means one who is supposed to be a follower of Christ in the moral virtues of his religion, without regard to his tenets, in comparison with other sectaries. And scripturally it means one who has first believed in Jesus as the Messiah, repented of his sins, and been immersed in water into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and who follows Christ in all his appointments. Such were they who were first called Christians at Antioch. Now in the latter sense it can never be applied to any but to those who resemble the disciples described in the Acts of the Apostles; while in the first and second sense of the term there are many Christians among the sects, and many that will put to shame those who refuse to award to them the style because of their mistake of the ordinances.

But as the ordinances are for man, for his sanctification and salvation, no one can enjoy the religion of Jesus without them; and no one can be saved at all who neglects them, the more intelligent sectaries themselves being judges in the case. To mistake them, to neglect them, to disdain them, are very different manifestations of the heart. While all sober-minded men can contemplate the first with hope of forgiveness, they must look upon the second and the third with fearful anticipations of a fiery indignation. But in this day of increasing light, I confess that, in my opinion, the cases of involuntary ignorance are becoming fewer and more few; and that the hope of remission for many who do not, who will not examine and obey from the heart the Saviour's precepts, becomes more and more feeble; and therefore there

is no very bright side of the picture for these who are at ease in Zion—whose fear of God is taught by the precepts of men, rather than by the oracles of Apostles and Prophets. A. C.

REVIVALISM IN SCOTLAND.

The following extract is from '*Galignani's Messenger*,' Paris, October 1st, 1839, forwarded to this office by the politeness of a friend. The French have no great relish for revivals, it is true; but this is quoted from the Glasgow Chronicle, a paper no less favorable to what is regarded as mere animal excitement. If the sedate, and rational, and argumentative sects can be so imposed on, with what charity ought we to contemplate similar, if not worse scenes in our warm, plethoric, and excitable population of the middle and southern states. A. C.

REVIVAL MANIA IN SCOTLAND.

Most extraordinary scenes have been enacted at Kilsyth since Sunday morning last. It appears to have been understood among the Revivalists, that there was to be on Sunday "a great manifestation of the power of the Lord" at Kilsyth; and, in consequence, there were assembled in the village on that day people from the farthest north to the English borders. Beds had been bespoken for weeks previous; but the accommodation in such a place as Kilsyth was quite inadequate for the multitudes that poured in, and hundreds had to bivouac in the open air. Every kind of conveyance from Glasgow was taken up, and fares were inordinately raised. The greater number of the clergymen present belonged to the Established Church; but there were also Dissenters of different denominations—Baptists, Methodists, &c. The services began in the parish church at 10 o'clock in the morning, and in an open field soon after, where they were persevered in till 6 o'clock on Monday morning. They were resumed on Monday at 10, and were continued through the whole day and ensuing night. A third time the vast congregation assembled yesterday forenoon, and we understand the proceedings are not yet at a close, and scenes of a most deplorable nature were exhibited. On one hand was to be seen the baptismal rite administered to great numbers, by immersion in the mill-dam; and on another, women throwing themselves on the ground, and crying out for mercy. Nor was the language of the preachers calculated to calm the storm One reverend gentleman told a portion of his audience that he "saw the Devil looking out of their eyes;" on which several women fell down insensible. At another time the preacher, in speaking of Jacob's ladder, as a type of the Saviour, called on his hearers to come to it, and to make use of it; but finding the impression not so strong as he wished, he cried out that there was rottenness at the foot, and they must come quickly; and, suiting the action to the word, he sprang up in the pulpit as if to catch hold of the ladder by a high spar, ere it was

snatched away from him. There was an old French minister among the preachers. Altogether the scene has been one of a most melancholy and humiliating nature. We think less of the effects produced on hysteric females, than of the conduct of the clergy. We can scarcely believe these gentlemen are mad; but if they are not mad, what is to be thought of them? On this, as on previous occasions, the chief actors in the scene were the clergy and the women. The physical wants of the assembled thousands bore also hard on the villagers; as on Sunday evening scarcely a loaf was to be had for love or money. "This *revival* mania (says a correspondent) has boarded our canal boats, and where formerly a blind old man might be found drawing a few pence from the compassion of the passengers, through the strains of his fiddle, we have now regular conventicles. Yesterday evening I came into Glasgow from Kirkintilloch, in one of the canal boats, and was astonished to find a company of people engaged in religious exercises, with all the fervor peculiar to them. The service was led by a clergyman who gave out a psalm, which was sung by his followers (mostly women;) he then prayed and preached in the revival strain. A number of the other passengers, conceiving that this mode of acting was quite improper in a promiscuous company confined together on board of a small boat, exhibited symptoms of impatience, on which they were denounced as children of the devil and heirs of hell. This led to an altercation of so violent a nature, that the master of the boat had to interfere, and ultimately the Revivalists were shown into a place by themselves, where they might indulge their fancies without incommoding or disgusting others." On Wednesday night the Rev. Wm. Burns preached in the High Church, Paisley, to a crowded audience, consisting indiscriminately of both Churchmen and Dissenters. The sermon was delivered with a degree of ability seldom surpassed. The blessing was pronounced about midnight, and up to that hour the passages, stairs, porches, and every corner of the building was crowded to excess. We understand that the desire to hear Mr. Burns is so great, that yesterday he had to preach for about an hour, when on his passage west in the great canal tract-boat.

Glasgow Chronicle.

RELIGIOUS EXCITEMENT—*No. I.*

NOTHING is more demonstrable than that all true religion is founded upon the true knowledge of the true God and our Saviour Jesus Christ. The polar star of all our researches into this subject are the words of the Messiah: "It is eternal life to *know* thee the only true God, and Jesus the Messiah thy Apostle." If "without faith it be impossible to please God," as true it is, without knowledge there can be no faith. "How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard—of whom they know nothing?" "By the *knowledge* of him shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities.'

"Now thanks be unto God who always causes us to triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest the *savor of his knowledge* by us in every place." "His divine power has gifted to us all things that pertain to life and godliness through the *knowledge of him* that hath called us to glory and virtue.

Now as this true knowledge of the true God and our Saviour Jesus Christ is in the Bible, and in the Bible alone, those ignorant of that book cannot possibly enjoy this knowledge; and, not possessing it, they cannot possess the benefits which it communicates. So that we are by an insuperable necessity constrained to deny the possibility of true faith and true religion without the knowledge of God and of Christ Jesus our Lord—without the knowledge and belief of the gospel as written in the New Covenant of our Lord and Saviour. From all which the reference is irresistible that all religion founded not upon right conceptions of God and of his Son, is delusion—rank delusion, and must leave the heart under the dominion of its own corruptions. Hence the necessity of enlightening the understanding and of opening the eyes to the light of God, as preliminary to conversion—real and evangelical conversion to God through Christ.

It was from this view of this subject that in the commission of Christ, and in that of the Apostles, *illumination* is the first item. "Thus saith Jehovah, I will give thee for a covenant of the people for a *light* of the Gentiles, to *open the blind eyes*, to bring out the prisoners from the prison, and them that *sit in darkness* out of the prison house." So spake the Lord by Isaiah of the mission of Jesus. So said Jesus to the Apostles: "Go, teach"—go, enlighten "all nations." And to Paul he said, "I now send thee to the Gentiles, to *open their eyes*, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of satan to God." It is then demonstrated that knowledge, or illumination, in the being, perfections, and glory of God, in the person, mission, and character of the Messiah, is, in all cases, preliminary to true faith—to rational belief—to any acceptable worship: in one word, to true religion.

What, then, shall we think of that religion which is the mere offspring of excited feeling—of sympathy with tones, and attitudes, and gestures—of the noise, and tumult, and shoutings of enthusiasm—of the machinery of the mourning bench, the anxious seat, the boisterous interlocutory prayers, intercessions, and exhortations to "get religion on the spot," &c. &c. with which all are conversant who frequent revival meetings in seasons of great excitement!

It generally—very open, indeed, proves itself to be animal and imaginative: for when the warmth is over—when the animal powers

begin to flag and the pulse is reduced to a healthy action, it is all cold and dark within as before. There is no fire in the soul—no light, nor knowledge, nor faith resting upon the Rock of Ages; and therefore the frequent apostacies, backslidings, and public scandals brought upon the Christian name and profession by those enrolled among the converts at some great ingathering.

Those who have observed with the greatest accuracy the history of revivals and the consequences upon society, have greatly doubted whether, upon the whole and in the long run, they are not a real disadvantage to the cause of true and vital religion. A shrewd Lawyer of my acquaintance, no way inimical to religion, except in so far as all men of the world are naturally averse to the yoke and restraint of Christ, took notes of all the revivals in the Methodist church of a certain village not a hundred miles from Wellsburg, for a period of some ten or twelve years. On summing up the various converts made at sundry times during that period in a population of some eight or ten hundred adults, he found that the number of converts equalled, if not exceeded, the whole adult population of the town; and yet at no time down to the present has that society counted a hundred communicants! Although Methodism has taken the lead in excitements, protracted meetings, and multitudinous conversions, she is not now in possession of the patent for these great moral engines. The time has expired, and other denominations are in occupancy of the right.

All that believe in these great movements of flesh and blood possess them, while no showers of this sort of grace fall upon Episcopalians, Romanists, Quakers, Covenanters, and the true long-lived old and uncontaminated Puritans. While I believe that some good is done by such meetings and efforts, I have always believed that a great deal more was lost than gained by them; and constant observation has confirmed the verdict of former years. Still I am favorably prepossessed towards protracted meetings. To fix the mind for a long time on the subject of religion, to abandon the business, and care, and perplexity, and pleasures of this life for some days in succession, and to turn all our thoughts to religious truth, to things unseen and eternal, is, in my judgment, sound wisdom and discretion. But on such occasions the people must be fed with the bread and water of life—with the word of God—with the gospel facts—revelations, precepts, and promises, and not with dreams, anecdotes, fictions, ballads, and unmeaning vociferations. No effort ought ever to be made to raise the feelings, the affections, or the passions beyond the understanding and the faith of the hearers.

Men ought not to be drawn to Christ by any thing not in Christ.

The Lord Jesus, in all his divine and human excellencies—in all his fulness of grace and truth—of righteousness and mercy—of condescension and love, should be unveiled and shown to them that know him not. When invited to *come*, it ought to be to the true and scriptural Jesus Christ, and neither to a sect, a creed, a priest, a tenet, a mourning bench, a prayer-meeting, nor to an imaginative Saviour: not to a Jewish Messiah, a Turkish Prophet, a martyr, or human mediator; but to the Messiah of God as revealed by all the Apostles and Prophets.

There are multitudes now who give all reasonable evidence that their Messiah, their Saviour, is not the one preached by Paul and Peter. There are still many false Christs, who deceive many. Imaginative Lords and Saviours, created out of the ignorance and infidelity of the human heart, have supplanted the true Messiah in the minds of multitudes. There are some who are in love with a Christ of their own imagination, that would renounce the true Christ if they saw him as he is. They love and worship a God and a Saviour they will never find after they leave these prison-houses of error and darkness in which they now reside.

Preachers ought to take heed that they are free from the blood of all men, by representing things just as they are; by exhibitting the truth as it is in Jesus; and by introducing men to the Lord by a fair and impartial representation of his own character. They ought to make no appeals to any corrupt principle in human nature when persuading men to put on Christ. If they do, their converts will be a crown of shame to them in the day of the Lord Jesus. The gospel furnishes its own arguments, motives, and allurements. To use these is fair and honorable, and will be approved by the Lord. But to use other than these, is to dishonor the Lord and to delude men.

Many get religion and join a party who are full of ignorance and void of the true belief. They are really the worse for being converted. If not worse men, they are in a worse condition. They are more unapproachable, more inaccessible to the truth of life. "Their last state is worse than the first." I have heard that Bible readings and Bible conversations were proscribed at a recent great excitement, called "a revival," because interrupting the harmony of the artificial machinery thrown around the poor uneducated seekers for religion. Certainly it is no exaggeration to say that many of those converted by prayer and shouting know not one chapter in the Bible.

But they say the Spirit works without the Bible as well as with it. If so, then the Bible is a superfluity. But this is a rank delusion! The Spirit, indeed, works still; it sanctifies still; but it is "*through*

the truth," and not without it, nor before it; but *with* and *through* it. All that are taught by the Spirit know God and Christ as the Apostles revealed them. There is no new revelation contradictory of the old one—no new Christ—no new spirit—no new Bible—no new Apostles—no new schemes, or new ways to heaven.

The machinery of modern revivals is not divine, but human. It is certainly delusive. They are undoubtedly deceived who repose the slightest confidence in it. The spirit of the Crusades is in it—the spirit of fanaticism is in it—the spirit of delusion is in it. The Spirit of God is not in it, else he was not in the Apostles; for he taught them no such schemes—no such means of catching men. This is a bait which was never put by Christ's fisherman on the evangelical hook. "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this, there is no light in them." So I believe and so I teach. A. C.

FAMILY CULTURE.

CONVERSATIONS AT THE CARLTON HOUSE.

No. IV.

HAVING read a second time the fourth chapter of Genesis, Olympas proceeded to ask general questions on some points slightly touched in past conversations.

Olympas. I promised, this morning, to interrogate some of the elder members of my household on faith at this lesson. I hope you have all been thinking of it to-day. Tell me, Thomas, the sum of our winter lesson on faith.

Thomas. You have frequently taught us to discriminate between the definition of a *word* and the description of a *thing*. The word *faith* means *belief of testimony*, or the persuasion that a report is true. It therefore implies four things: One that reports—the hearing of the report—the understanding of the report—and the assenting to it as true. If it be assented to, the report is believed: if it be not assented to, it is either doubted or disbelieved; for you say that there are but three states of mind concerning any report.

Olympas. True: every report appears to us true, untrue, or doubtful. When it appears true, it is believed; when it appears untrue, it is disbelieved; when it appears neither true nor untrue, it is doubted. You say faith implies four things: A reporter, or a witness—hearing—

understanding—and assurance. Can you refer to the scripture, Edward, that so represents the subject?

Edward. Paul to the Romans says, "Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." But how do you make four things out of this brief account of the matter? The "word of God" is the testimony; for if he did not speak we could not hear. That hearing comes by speaking is as certain as that faith comes by hearing. If no one speaks, nothing can be heard; if nothing be heard, nothing can be understood; if nothing be understood, nothing can be believed. God speaks—the ear hears—the soul perceives—the heart believes. So that a *voice*, an *ear*, an *understanding*, and a *heart* are all essential to the faith that saves the soul.

Olympas. But is there not something peculiar to saving faith, contradistinguishing it from every other faith? Tell me, Thomas, what that is?

Thomas. I remember only this difference, that God must always either speak the saving truth himself, or sanction those who speak it.

Olympas. You mean, then, that saving faith is the belief of saving truth: for it is not the believing, but the thing believed, that saves the soul, purifies the heart, and overcomes the world.

Thomas. Yes, sir; the power of believing is as much in the belief or thing believed, as the power of seeing is in the sight, or of eating in the food. It is neither eating nor drinking that sustains life, but the things eaten and drank. So it is not believing, but the thing or truth believed that saves the soul.

Olympas. Saving faith is therefore the belief of saving truth. Now as God alone can speak, propound, or inspire saving truth, the faith that saves the soul has this peculiarity—that the truth believed is divine or inspired; and, therefore, no man can say that Jesus is Lord but by a divine testifier as well as a divine testimony. Any other peculiarity in the faith of the gospel, Edward?

Edward. This faith having a *person* rather than a *thing* for its final object, has always in it the idea we call confidence. Hence you say that we both believe Christ and believe *in* him, because he is both the testifier and the testimony.

Olympas. Not only the testifier and the testimony, but because the testifier Jesus is so placed before us in the testimony as to constrain our confidence in him and affection for him. Thus faith in Christ works by love. Demons believe Christ, but cannot believe in him. Why is it, William, that demons can believe Christ and not believe in him?

William. Because, I presume, Christ offers them nothing in him-

self. He makes them no proposition—no offer. He shows them no favor; therefore no promise, no trust, no hope, and no love.

Olympas. Very just, William. No promise, no trust, no hope, no love. If, then, demons believe, they must hate and tremble, because their evil nature and evil deeds call for vengeance; and the guilty always hates the avenger. Are there not some wicked men, think you, who, like the demons, believe and tremble.

William. If there were none such, I know not why James should have brought up their case.

Olympas. Tell me, Thomas, in the fewest words, the difference between the faith of a reprobate and a Christian.

Thomas. The latter believe *in* Christ—the former only believes him. The Christian trusts in Christ, because he appropriates all his testimony. The reprobate does not trust in him because he cannot appropriate his promises

Olympas. There are those who reject a part of the testimony of Christ, and receive a part of it. But is not this an error of the understanding, rather than of the heart? or, to express myself more familiarly, are there not some persons who only believe a part of the testimony, because of their ignorance or prejudice, who are nevertheless well disposed to Christ, and not under the influence of a reigning depravity?

Thomas. I cannot answer this question.

Olympas. Can any of you?——All are silent. Well, mother, we must call upon you.

Mrs. Harriet Olympas. The question I could not answer but from my own experience. I remember for a time I did believe Christ without trusting in him, without appropriating any of his promises. I was not happy. But so soon as I discovered certain promises which suited my case, I not only believed Christ, but believed in him. I therefore conclude that all are not reprobates who do not trust in Christ. Some there doubtless may be. But many, like myself, badly educated, believe only a part of the testimony, and either understand not or observe not other parts of it. I am now assured that all who know the gospel will trust in Jesus, not only as the Messiah, but as their own Saviour and Redeemer.

Olympas. I believe my question was too abstract, but it is now well answered. We shall proceed to more simple and intelligible matters. How many kinds of faith do the scriptures speak of, William?

William. They say there is but *one faith.*

Olympas. But that may be "*the truth*" simply: for instance, when we are commanded to "contend for the faith formerly delivered to the saints," it denotes the truth handed down through them.

William. I read of "*faith unfeigned,*" and I presume that one epithet always implies another: there must, therefore, be two kinds of faith—viz. a *feigned* and an *unfeigned* faith.

Olympas. These terms do not represent two sorts of faith, but two sorts of professions of it. There are the sincere believer and the pretender.

Edward. There are a dead faith and a living faith.

Olympas. But a dead faith, like a dead man, represents not a distinct thing, but the same thing in another state. As the same man may be living or dead, so the same faith may be dead or alive.

Thomas. I understood you to say that there were a true faith and a false faith.

O. I did. But true faith is the belief of truth; and a false faith is the belief of falsehood. Remember that faith is faith, and neither more nor less. Many "believe a lie;" still they have faith. They are deceived in the object; but they are persuaded of its truth. So far as believing is concerned, like seeing or hearing, the act or operation is uniformly the same; but the object may be very different. He that believes the truth has true faith, and he that believes a falsehood has false faith. Do you remember, Reuben, the remarks of Evangelicus, the preacher, who staid with us all night, last Christmas, on the power of faith?

Reuben. I think he represented the power of faith to in be the *object* rather than in the *subject.* He showed us that we may have weak faith or strong faith; but the soul-subduing, salutary, and all-conquering power of faith was in the thing believed rather than in the believer. It was what Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Moses, &c. believed that imparted to them the power by which they obtained for themselves an eternal fame.

Olympas. This brings us back to the place of beginning. This examination of faith originated in the account given of Abel's acceptance at the altar, and Paul's comment upon it. It was by faith that Abel obtained acceptance and a good report, God testifying of his gifts. We simply argued from the fact of Abel's faith, that revelations and promises were more full and clear than we now suppose were enjoyed by the antediluvians.

Reuben. How could Adam say to Eve on the day of her creation, "And for thee henceforth shall a man forsake father and mother, brother and sister, and to thee shall he adhere as his own flesh," before the relations of father, mother, brother and sister existed? How did he know any thing about fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters?

Olympas. I shall put this question round your class. Can any of you explain this mystery?

Thomas Dilworth. It does not so read in my Bible. Adam does not mention brother or sister in the whole affair, nor does he say any thing about adhering to Eve as his own flesh.

Olympas. True, Reuben has not put the question as it is in the book; still the difficulty is the same: for as yet there was nothing revealed about father, mother, wife, or child. Adam seems to have been wiser than his years or his experience. If we will allow our Lord to interpret this passage we shall find an easy solution of this apparent difficulty. The words are not Adam's: they are God's own institution of marriage in his own language. It is not altogether evident that Adam even uttered them; but whether or not, it was God who spoke through him. Do you remember, William, the passage in which the Saviour comments on this transaction?

William. In Matthew's Testimony, nineteenth chapter, fourth and fifth verses, it is thus explained: "Have you not read that he that made them at the beginning made them a male and a female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and they two shall be one flesh: therefore they are no more two, but one flesh."

Olympas. The matter is decided. Jesus says that these words are the Creator's, and not Adam's. "What, therefore," adds Jesus, "God has joined together let not man put asunder." This addition in Matth. xix. 6. makes these words not only God's, but it presents them in the form of an institution. It is worthy of note while we are called back to this subject, that God has positively condemned both celibacy and polygamy in this transaction, with all that accompanies them. Can you tell, Reuben, how celibacy is condemned?

Reuben. I know not, unless it be in the reason that God gave for the formation of a woman. He said, "It is *not good* for man to be alone."

Olympas. And certainly in so saying he intimated very clearly that it is *bad to be alone:* for what is not good must of necessity be bad. Every son of Adam should then find for himself the lost rib in the person of some suitable daughter of Eve. And how, think you, Edward, is polygamy prohibited in this affair?

Edward. It must be tacitly: for nothing is intimated concerning marriage with one or more persons. Is it not inferred to be unreasonable and evil from the fact, that God made it impossible for Adam to have but one wife? Wherefore did he create but one woman, if he intended a plurality of wives?

Olympas. True: with him, as Malachi has observed, was at that time the residue of the Spirit. "And wherefore did he only make one?" The answer is as divine as the question: for the Prophet adds,

"That he might seek a godly seed." Polygamy has corrupted the offspring of man, while celibacy prevented it. They are both contrary to the revealed will of God *at the beginning*. Moses, indeed, tolerated divorces because he feared the cruelty of wicked husbands—"because of the hardness of your hearts" he permitted a bill of divorce: but from the beginning it was not so. Is there any Christian law on this subject, Thomas?

Thomas. Paul, you told us, alluded to this when he said, "Let every man have his own wife," (not wives,) "and every woman her own husband."

Olympas. This command prohibits these two great errors from the ancient order of things—celibacy and polygamy. They are alike contrary to reason, nature, and providence.

Thomas. How are they contrary to providence?

Olympas. Because God has most remarkably preserved such an equality between the sexes in point of numbers, as to evince his opposition both to celibacy and polygamy—as to make it possible for every man to have his own wife, and for every woman to have her own husband, and robbery to have more than one.

Mrs. Olympas. Do you not thus condemn Abraham, Jacob, David, Solomon, Paul, and Many others?

Olympas. Abraham did wrong in conforming to a wicked custom, and brought upon himself severe afflictions, as did Jacob, David, and Solomon. What wise or good man could possibly envy their lot? There appears a million of times more temporal, more rational, more refined bliss in one equally yoked and loving and beloved wedded pair, than any of these renowned characters enjoyed. Domestic bliss was not often a guest with them. Paul, indeed, was justified for his celibacy, because of the existing distress and the great work on his shoulder. And in some rare instances, of a similar character, an individual may be allured to prefer celibacy to a gift from the Lord. Still, I opine, these occasions in our day are rare indeed; and therefore it is not good for Adam to be without Eve.

Mrs. Olympas. The Pope, however, says it is better for himself and his ecclesiastics to be alone than to have every one his own wife.

Olympas. Indeed, the Pope, willing to make his power known, seems often to delight in opposing God and Christ, and the Holy Apostles and Prophets; and hence when God says, "It is not good man to be alone," or without a wife, the Pope says, "It is good for man to be alone, because he can serve the Lord better alone than with a wife." And, strange to tell, this is the man that pretends to be the successor, not of Paul, who made himself a eunuch for the kingdom of

heaven's sake; but of "*Peter the Vicar of Christ*," who had a wife and family!! But how far are we got off from the fourth chapter of Genesis! Tell me, Susan, where did our last lesson end?

Susan. At Lamech, the son of Methusael, who took to him two wives.

Olympas. And what were their names?

Susan. Adah and Zillah.

Olympas. It is a singular fact that only five names of women that lived in the first two thousand years of the world have reached our time. Can any of you tell the names of these five women?

Eliza. They are Eve, Adah, Zillah, Naamah, and Sarah the wife of Abraham.

Olympas. Strange oblivion of female excellence and renown! Of these five, only two are favorably known to us. Other two of them were the wives of the first polygamist. It is worthy of note that polygamy and war commenced in the Cain branch of Adam's family.

Olympas. How, Thomas, ought the 23d verse of this chapter to be pointed?

Thomas. You read it thus:—"Hear my voice, you wives of Lamech! Have I slain a man that I should be wounded, or a young man that I should be hurt. If the killing of Cain should be avenged seven fold, surely he that kills Lamech would be punished with seventy and seven fold vengeance!"

Olympas. Such is the punctuation most accordant with the most rational scope of this dark passage. It supposes some fears for the life of Lamech on the part of his wives. They had not very peaceful consciences, and were fearful of the life of their husband. Polygamy seems to have been a curse from its beginning. A. C.

CHARTER OF THE BETHANY COLLEGE.

THROUGH the assiduous and kind attention of *John C. Campbell*, Esq. of this county, during his visit to Richmond for the improvement of his health, while the Legislature was in session, the following liberal Charter of the *College department* of our plan of a New Institution has been granted by the Government of this Commonwealth; and thus a proper foundation has been laid for the safe investment of the funds necessary to the establishment and continued existence of that great scheme of physical, intellectual, and moral culture, of which the College proper is a very necessary part. A. C.

A BILL INCORPORATING THE BETHANY COLLEGE.

SECT. 1. *Be it enacted by the General Assembly*, That there be, and is hereby erected and established, at or near Bethany, in the county of Brooke, in this Commonwealth, a Seminary of learning for the instruction of youth in the various branches of science and literature, the useful arts, agriculture, and the learned and foreign languages.

Sect. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That the said seminary shall be known and called by the name of Bethany College.

Sect. 3. *And be it further enacted*, That Alexander Campbell, Albert G. Ewing, Samuel Church, Henry Langly, James T. M'Vay, Robert Y. Henley, Samuel Grafton, William Stewart, Josiah Crumbacker, Adamson Bentley, Robert Nicholls, Campbell Tarr, Matthew M'Keever, John Andrews, Robert H. Forrester, Thomas Campbell, Robert Richardson, and John C. Campbell, be, and are hereby constituted and appointed Trustees of said College; who, and their successors, shall be a body politic and corporate, by the name of the Trustees of Bethany College; and shall have a perpetual succession and a common seal, which seal they may alter at pleasure. And by the name aforesaid they and their successors shall be capable in law, and shall have full power and authority to acquire, hold, possess, purchase, receive, and retain to them and their successors for ever, any lands, tenements, rents, goods, chattels, or interests of any kind whatsoever, which may be given to them or by them purchased for the use of said College; to transfer, convey, and dispose of the same in any way whatsoever they shall adjudge most useful to the interests and legal purposes of the institution; and by the same name to sue and implead, be sued and impleaded, answer and be answered in all courts of law and equity; to select and employ a Treasurer, and such other officers, agents, and servants as they may see proper; to elect and employ such President, Professors, Instructors, and Tutors, for the benefit of said College as they may deem necessary; to make, ordain, establish, and execute, or cause to be executed, all such by-laws, rules, and ordinances, not inconsistent with the constitution and laws of the United States or of this Commonwealth, as they may think necessary for the welfare of said College, the good government of the Professors, Instructors, Tutors, Agents, and Stewarts of the same; and generally to do all acts necessary and proper to promote the welfare and prosperity of said institution.

Sect. 4. *And be it further enacted*, That the President of the College, by and with the advice and consent of the Trustees, shall have power from time to time to ordain, regulate, and establish the mode and course of instruction and education to be pursued in said College; and, together with such Professors, Instructors, and Tutors as the corporation may designate, shall be styled the Faculty of the College, and shall have power to adopt and enforce such rules as may be deemed expedient for the good government of the institution; which rules and regulations shall not be inconsistent with the constitution and laws of the United States or of this Commonwealth, nor with the by-laws or ordinances of the corporation, and shall remain in force until disapproved of by the Trustees present at any meeting, or a majority of them, and no longer.

Sect. 5. *And be it further enacted*, That the first meeting of the Trustees designated in the third section of this act, shall be held at Bethany aforesaid, on the second Monday in May next, or at any time afterwards, on a day agreed on by any three or more Trustees, and by them duly announced by publication in some newspaper published in the aforesaid county of Brooke; at which meeting the said Trustees assembled, if there shall be a quorum present, may proceed to appoint

such officers and transact such business as they shall judge necessary; but if a quorum shall not be present, those assembled shall have the power of adjourning from day to day, or to any future day, until a quorum shall be had. After a President shall have been elected, he shall preside in all meetings of the Board of Trustees, unless unavoidably absent: in such cases a President *pro tempore* shall be elected from their own body; but in no case shall the President be entitled to a vote, unless he shall also be a member of the Board of Trustees. All questions shall be decided by a concurring vote of the majority of the Trustees present, except in the cases hereinafter provided.

Sect. 6. *And be it further enacted*, That the said President and Trustees, or any seven of them, shall have full power and authority to meet at such times as they shall think necessary for the examination of any candidates for literary degrees, and they are hereby authorized and empowered to confer such degrees on such persons as in their opinion shall merit the same, in as ample a manner as any other College in this Commonwealth can do; and under their common seal to grant testimonials thereof, signed by the President and seven of the Trustees at least. The President and seven Trustees shall at any time form a quorum for business; or, in the absence of a President, eight Trustees, of whom one shall be elected President *pro tempore:* and should there be at any meeting less than a quorum, they shall have the power of adjourning from day to day, or to any future day, until a quorum shall be had.

Sect. 7. *And be it further enacted*, That the said Trustees, or a quorum of them, shall annually elect a Treasurer for said College, who shall give bond with approved security, payable to the Trustees by their name aforesaid, and their successors, conditioned faithfully to discharge the duties of his said office, and shall render an account of all monies, goods, and chattels received and expended by him on account of, and for the use of said College; and on failure or refusal so to do, shall be subject to the like proceedings as are prescribed by law in the case of Sheriffs failing to account for and pay into the Treasury of this Commonwealth the public taxes collected by them; such proceedings to be conducted in the name of the Trustees in their corporate and politic character aforesaid: *Provided*, That no appropriation, payment, or disbursement shall at any time be made by the Treasurer, but such as shall be in pursuance of the directions or orders of the Trustees.

Sect. 8. *And be it further enacted*, That the said Trustees, or a quorum of them, shall have power to remove or suspend the President, or any of the Professors, Instructors, or Tutors at any time, two-thirds of such quorum concurring, and also two-thirds concurring to remove any of the Trustees for good cause; and when there shall be a vacancy in said Board of Trustees, occasioned by death, removal, resignation, or refusal to act, the remaining Trustees, or a quorum of them, shall supply the vacancy. It shall also be lawful for any three of the Trustees, or the President, or the Professors for the time being, or a majority of them, to call a meeting of the Trustees whenever they or he, as the case may be, shall deem it expedient, by giving at least ten days' notice of such meeting, in the mode prescribed in the fifth section of this act.

Sect. 9. *And be it further enacted*, That whenever any Trustee shall

absent himself from three successive annual meetings of the Board of Trustees, without assigning a sufficient reason, at the fourth the Trustees of said College, or a quorum of them, shall have power, by entry on their minutes, to declare his seat vacant, and proceed to the election of a new Trustee to supply such vacancy.

Sect. 10. *And be it further enacted*, That the said Trustees and their successors are hereby authorized, so far as their funds may warrant, to admit gratuitously, in whole or in part, as their respective cases may require, such person or persons as they may think proper.

Sect. 11. *And be it further enacted*, That the Trustees of said College shall have power to establish a department of agriculture in said College: *Provided nevertheless*, That no pupil or student in the College aforesaid shall be required to study or labor in said department in any manner contrary to the wishes of the person or persons at whose charge and by whom such student or pupil has been placed in the institution aforesaid.

Sect. 12. *And be it further enacted*, That there shall be annual stated meetings of the said Board of Trustees, to be held at such time as the said Trustees shall at their first meeting under the authority of this act appoint; but they shall have power at any subsequent meeting to alter such day as to them may seem expedient, and so on from time to time. It shall be the duty of the said Board of Trustees, when thereto required, to make a report of the general condition of the College to the President and Directors of the Literary Fund, to be by them communicated to the General Assembly.

Sect. 13. *And be it further enacted*, That the said Board of Trustees shall never be less than twelve nor more than thirty in number; and the said Board, from time to time, at any regular meeting, may, by appointments, create additional Trustees, not exceeding in all the greater number specified in this section.

14. *And be it further enacted*, That nothing herein contained shall be so construed as at any time to authorize the establishment of a Theological Professorship in the said College.

This act shall be in force from and after the passage thereof.

THE FIRST DONATION.

The first donation for the establishment of our New Institution was made by our much lamented brother *Philip B. Pendleton*, of Virginia, whose decease was noticed some months since on our pages. The information of this generous bequest is received in the following note:—

Benvenue, *King & Queen*, 23d February, 1840.

Sir—My brother, Philip B. Pendleton, departed this life the 28th December last, leaving a Will, in which he bequeaths the sum of one thousand dollars (conditionally) to aid in establishing a school proposed by yourself. You will see it in Vol. III No. 10. page 446, proposing a plan for a Scientific, Literary, and Moral Institution. The conditions are that if the school is carried into effect in five years from the time of his death, he requests his Executors to pay to it the sum of one thousand dollars. He left Mr. James Smith and myself his Executors. Both of us have qualified. Yours with respect,

GEORGE M. PENDLETON.

One hundred such contributions will set us a-going; and we have such confidence in the Lord and in the brethren, as to believe that we shall not be disappointed in our expectations in reference to the means of establishing an institution so universally approved, and so much needed. A. C.

THE JEWS' LOVE OF JUDEA.

The most interesting circumstance which presents itself to my mind, in recalling what I saw of the Hebrew nation in the East, is the universal diffusion of the love, the undying love of the Jews for their own Judea, the Canaan of their fathers. Who could see, without emotion, thousands of poor Israelites, who, from the remotest parts of Europe, have made their way, by long and weary pilgrimage, through privations incalculable and suffering without end—often shoeless, and almost clothless—friendless, pennyless, that they might see the City of David and lay their bones in the bosom of Jerusalem! What multitudes are there among them who have sold their last possession—having gathered together their little, their inefficient all—and have started, marching towards the rising sun, from the Vistula, the Dnieper, and Danube, on a journey as long as perilous! How many have perished, exhausted on the way! How many have landed at Joppa, crossed the Taurus, at Antioch, have been unable, from over exhaustion, to reach their longed-for goal! How many have sunk in sight of the Mount of Olives! And how many have closed their eyes in peace and blessedness when the privilege has been vouchsafed to them of treading within the walls of Salem!——*Dr. Bowring.*

THE DUTY AND THE MEANS OF SUPPORTING EVANGELISTS——*No. I.*

By an Evangelist I mean one sent out by a particular congregation, or the whole church of a district, to preach the gospel—to convert sinners—to plant churches—and, by and with their consent or election, to assist in ordaining them elders, and in setting things in order amongst them. That such an office is essential to the spread and prevalence of the gospel in the present state of the world, and always, till the whole country be put under the control of the Christian Institution, is alike obvious from scriptural documents, and from our own experience and observation. And this we shall not, after all that has been written on the subject, farther argue at present. It is sufficient at this time to remember that the reformation of John the Baptist, the introduction of Christianity, Protestant reformation, and every other reformation a

at home and abroad, has been effected by such a class of operators, however they may have been titled or distinguished by their contemporaries. We have adopted the ancient order of things as our precedent in this great business; and now for the execution or farther practical development and efficient application of the principles of that order.

In the first place, then, one "*who labors in the word and teaching*,' whether he be a *teaching* elder located in a special charge, or an *evangelist* sent abroad, ought to give himself wholly to this work—he ought "to preach the word," and "to be instant in season and out of season" as ordained the Apostle. He must give himself "to the ministry of the word and prayer." "No man that warreth entangleth himself with the businesses of this life that he may please him who has chosen him to be a soldier"—"that his profitting may be apparent to all." Therefore he ought "to give himself wholly to the work." Sinecure bishops, pensioned officers, and stall-fed evangelists are unknown in the Christian kingdom. They may belong to the Man of Sin, but not to Him who *went about continually doing good.*

Now what axiom in mathematics is more evident than that he that thus gives himself wholly to the Lord and his people, should be wholly sustained by them? And so decides all honest men, as well as the Sacred Oracles. Hence the great Chief Justice of the Christian kingdom has solemnly decreed that "*they who preach the gospel shall live by the gospel.*" To this high and righteous decree we invite the consideration of all the faithful brethren who have any demur on this subject.

If any one chooses he may waive his right, or he may distribute the avails of his labors to the necessities of the saints; or to the wants of the poor; but no just or honorable man who has it in his power to remunerate him, can ask him to labor for nothing, either in a common cause or in any private one, not his own. Justice is never lost sight of in any divine institution. God, though so abundant in goodness and rich in mercy, forgives not a sin, nor shows a favor unjustly. "Justice and judgment are the habitation of his throne." He is a just God and a Saviour: therefore, he will not have any one eased and another burdened in the dispensation of righteousness and mercy over which he presides. Therefore has the Lord ordained that they who preach the gospel shall live by it.

There is much wisdom as well as justice in this ordinance of God. It is in harmony with universal experience and observation that every one most faithfully and cordially devotes his energies to a calling in which not only his conscientiousness, his benevolence, but even his

duties to himself and family, constrain his efforts and prompt his endeavors. If, then, we desire to have assiduous and faithful laborers in the Lord's vineyard, we will, as far as we can, engage the whole man in the work of the Lord. We will take hold of his conscience, his benevolence, and his personal and family interests, that it may secure his undivided energies in the advancement of the spiritual and eternal interests of mankind.

It is more than probable that for this reason, as well as that the service might be better performed under the former dispensation, the Lord ordained that those who waited upon the altar should live on the offerings presented on that altar. Even so has the Lord now ordained that they who preach the gospel should live by their calling, and find their temporal, spiritual, and eternal interests all promoted by faithfully serving the Lord in the gospel of his Son.

That this ordinance of High Heaven may be abused is not only every way possible, but exceedingly probable; and that it has been so all the world knows. Men have called themselves faithful laborers for the Lord while all the week laboring for themselves as well as on the Sabbath—six days under pay on the farm or in the school, and on the seventh in the pulpit. This has often occurred. This abuse, however, reflects not in the least either upon the wisdom or the justice of the Author of the ordinance; any more than the abuse of prayer or praise, or baptism or the supper, or the Lord's day. These are all gracious and blissful institutions, however men may prostitute them to their own detriment and dishonor. The ordinance of a ministry, and for the support of it, is as positive and as clear from the New Testament as the institution of baptism, the Lord's day and the Lord's supper. Having said so much against the abuse of this ordinance in the commencement of my labors; and finding that some have stretched and applied my remarks even against the utility and authority of the Lord's decree, I find it the more necessary to be exceedingly explicit on this now-a-days most neglected institution, so vital too to the furtherance of the gospel of Christ. "Let him, then, that is taught in the word communicate to him that teacheth in all good things." So ordained Paul and Jesus, and we must say Amen!

A. C.

News from the Churches.

Adamsville, M'Nairy county, Te. January 29, 1840.

Believing it is always a source of joy to you and the readers of the Harbinger, to hear of the rapid advance of the cause of the blest Jesus, I with pleasure comply with a

request of several of the teaching brethren, to give you the result of a vigorous effort made last Fall in the Western District of Tennessee, at a series of protracted meetings held at the following times and places:—First, at White's meeting house, Henderson county, Te. continued four days, including the second Lord's day in September—five immersed, six added; the prospect very favorable at that time. The laborers present were Gilliland, Holms, and myself.

Second, at Cypress, M'Nairy county continued four days, including the fourth Lord's day in September. Teachers in attendance, brethren Wynne, Sanders of Hardiman county, and myself—two added and one immersed.

Third, at Father Watkins, Madison county; continued some four or five days, including the fifth Lord's day in September. Teachers present, brethren C. Kendrick, Gist, and Gilliland—fifteen immersions.

Fourth, at Roane's Creek, Carroll county: teachers present, brethren C. Kendrick, Gist, Holms, Gilliland, and myself; continued six days, including the first Lord's day in October. Twenty-two additions, twenty immersions; prospects flattering

Fifth, at Clear Creek, in this vicinity, M Nairy county, including second Lord's day in October continued five days; teachers present, brethren Wynne, Sanders, Jones of Giles county, C. Kendrick, and myself; sixteen additions, ten immersions; prospects good.

Sixth, at New Hope, Hardiman county; continued five days, including third Lord's day in October. Teachers present, Wynne, Sanders, and myself. Six additions, and prospects very flattering.

Seventh, at White's meeting house, Henderson county; continued four days, including the fourth Lord's day in October. Attended by brethren Gist, Holms, and Gilliland. Eight additions.

The above accessions to the cause of our blessed Redeemer, including four others added at Clear Creek and White's meeting house, make seventy nine since the second Lord's day in September. I think I am correct in saying we have succeeded in putting down a mass of prejudice, and in correcting a great deal of misrepresentations at the above meetings. Having formed a co operation of almost all the churches in the Western District, having made provisions to keep two Evangelists in the field the present year, I am of opinion that religious matters will present a more pleasing aspect to the friends of reform before the close of the next summer.

The various churches in West Tennessee will please report by messenger, or letter, their number, and progress of the cause we plead, during next Spring and Summer, at a meeting to be held at Roan's Creek, Carroll county, commencing on Friday before the first Lord's day in October next. J. H. DUNN.

Cincinnati, Ohio, February 23, 1840

About one hundred and fifty persons, men and women, have been added to the church at Cincinnati, within the last four weeks, under the labors of brother J. Challen and R. C. Ricketts. G. W. RICE

Bedford, Ohio, February 12, 1840.

I would inform you what the Lord is still doing for us in Bedford. Surely there are many whose hearts he is opening to attend to the things which have been spoken. Already this year we have had added to the saved in this place twenty five. Brethren Bentley, of Solon, and Collins, of Chardon, have been holding a meeting for a few days in our place, which closed last Lord's day, at which fourteen of the above number were immersed. J. P. ROBISON.

Blairsville, Pa. February 26, 1840.

Peace and health be multiplied unto you through the knowledge of God and Jesus Christ our Lord! The cause of reformation is progressing slowly in this section of country. Last July we organized a congregation of seventeen in number in this vicinity; six have been added since. We are striving to maintain the apostolic practices. The congregation in Johnstown Cambria county, is advancing moderately toward the mark of our high calling, increasing in knowledge and numbers. I understand there was a congregation of twenty-five in number organized last Fall (or Summer) at Stoystown, Somerset county. I have not visited that section since.

NORMAN LANPHEAR.

Steubenville, Ohio, March 3, 1840.

When I came here there were but few comparatively of the members or friends that were constant attenders on the Lord's day, and they had no bishop. We now can scarcely find room to accommodate the large congregations that frequently assemble at the meeting-house, many of them members of the different churches in town. There appears to be a general interest prevailing in this place upon these subjects Since that union meeting I told you of when I saw you at Wellsburg, which took place on the 22d of December, we have received about twenty by immersion, and seven or eight reclaimed that had entirely quit meeting with the church besides several more becoming regular attenders who only met occasionally. We have had the assistance of our young brother C. D. Hurlbutt, of Pittsburg, who expects to take a school for some months in the country and preach for them. W. F. POOL.

Fayette, Mi, February 11, 1840.

Since the first of September last there have been eleven persons immersed, amongst whom were several Methodists of the first standing as to intelligence and morality. Four have been received from the Baptists Our present number with myself is sixteen. We have organized ourselves into a congregation, and meet nearly every Lord's day. Having no *house*, we cannot do as well as we wish in public meetings.

J. NEWTON HODGEN.

Euclid, Ohio, February 28, 1840.

We have just closed a four days' meeting, attended by brother John Henry. Six adult persons made the good confession that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and were buried with him by baptism into his death, and raised with him to walk in newness of life. One was added who had been immersed.

W. O. GONNER.

Pompey, New York, February 18, 1840.

I trust you have not forgotten that there is a congregation of disciples upon one of the high hills of Pompey, who consider their privileges as much superior to those of the professing religious community, as the land upon which we live is higher than the bed of the Erie Canal. So far does the gospel of our blessed Redeemer elevate us above the low degrading systems of men. We are living in perfect harmony among ourselves, and enjoying that affection for each other which sectarians themselves acknowledge is unknown in their ranks. The combined efforts of the sects to demolish "Campbellism," as they term the monster, has turned out for the furtherance of the gospel of Christ.

The happy influence which the gospel is calculated to effect is being felt in this country more and more, and we are encouraged to continue to lend our influence for the promotion of this best of all causes.

Our present number is between eighty and one hundred, who are intelligent and respectable disciples. There is a congregation of disciples in the town of Tully, in the southern part of this county, numbering about thirty, some of whom are unusually intelligent.

HARRY KNAP.

Georgetown, Kentucky, March 2, 1840.

I reached home a few evenings past, having been engaged with brother Moss for five weeks, day and night, in proclaiming the soul-inspiring truths of the Bible, connected with the ancient gospel The fields of our labor were Dover, Minerva, Germantown, Augusta, and the neighborhood of Flag Spring in Campbell county. We had a most glorious time, and obtained about one hundred and twenty additions to the best of all causes advocated by mortal man. Eighty of these were the fruits of our labors at good old Germantown. It only remains for the brethren to be true to themselves to secure the most unexampled triumph in modern times

You are aware that the Methodist College is located at Augusta. As this place lay in our way, and being strongly solicited by our friends, we resolved to give them an opportunity of a *hearing*. Various rumors had reached us. It was suggested that we were afraid to appear in Augusta. It was whispered that there might be efforts to open the doors of the Methodist meeting-house to us, provided we would admit replies to us. Again, it was rumored that we would be replied to at all events, if permitted.

Nothing daunted, we repaired to the place. No meeting-houses were opened to us. But, thanks be to the Lord, a most commodious building, formerly the court-house, but now belonging to a private citizen, was most courteously and kindly granted us, at the request of our friends. To that gentleman we feel under great obligations for his liberality and kindness.

We were met at the very commencement by Messrs. M'Cown and Watt—the first, the Professor of languages, of Augusta College, and a Preacher of that order; the latter, a Presbyterian preacher, recently of Virginia. The first encountered brother Moss, and the latter myself. Mr. Watt and myself passed several rounds on the subjects of creeds, baptism, and the operation of the Spirit in conversion. When he had satisfied himself we ceased by mutual consent. During the same period a debate was kept up between Mr. M'Cown and brother Moss in reference to the office of the Spirit in conversion This debate was continued until Mr. M'Cown considered that his College duties demanded his undivided attention. He then proposed, if agreeable to brother Moss, that Mr. Watt should continue the debate. This was acceded to, and thus it was prolonged for several days, and until they were satisfied. As soon as the debate closed the parties and their friends withdrew. Our doors were open, whilst theirs were closed This speaks volumes in favor of the truth. By present recollection is, that we obtained eleven confessions in Augusta, notwithstanding all the opposition, public and private. Many were convinced of the truth of what we plead, and a congregation of upwards of twenty rallied upon the Bible alone, to show forth the true principles of union and conversion Brother J Holton will act as their bishop; and he is, as you know, not only worthy of the station, but qualified to sustain the cause, no matter by whom opposed.

Our friends in Augusta, in and out of the congregation, are able to cope with our opponents. Thanks to the Lord, we obtained some noble-minded Methodists. We hope we have many friends amongst them, and we hope yet to gain more over to the glorious cause of pure truth. One of the most serious complaints I have against them is this:—While we are treated as unworthy of Christian fellowship and regard, they use all their

influence to retain those who have fellowship for us and the truths which we hold. This bears the impress of insincerity. Wherever this cause is plead, there is an evident shaking among the sects. There only safety, in my judgment, is in closing their eyes and stopping their ears. What an awful account have the prominent men to settle, who are blinding the minds of the people and preventing a union of Christians!

I cannot close without expressing the best feelings of my heart towards the citizens of Augusta, for their kind and respectful treatment; more especially for the hospitality received at the hands of Professor M'Cown. If the Lord spare me, I expect shortly to revisit Augusta and lend them a helping hand. Let me entreat you to visit them. Two points I considered as granted during the debate, which are of vast importance. I had urged that *baptize* never had been, to my knowledge translated *sprinkle* or *pour* by any scholar who had character to lose and that baptism was both a means and seal of pardon when administered to real penitents. The first position remained uncontroverted by either of the gentlemen. Whilst upon the latter, Professor M'Cown asserted publicly that such had been the doctrine of the Methodist Episcopal Church for the last hundred years, and quoted Wesley in proof. This is a great point from the fountain of literature. It was also admitted that the expressions 'born of water' and 'washing of regeneration' were allusions to baptism. He, however, observed that he preferred sprinkling and pouring for baptism, because the blood of Christ was said to be sprinkled, and the Spirit to be poured out This was a candid confession; and if all were equally candid the controversy would soon be at an end

I have received many letters from Virginia requesting a visit as an Evangelist. I had as well say to those beloved brethren, through the Harbinger, that not only my domestic concerns require much of my presence, but there is such a wide field for useful labor in Kentucky, that I cannot give a positive answer. I hope it may be in my power to visit the land of my fathers. J. T. JOHNSON.

Harrodsburg, Ky., February 29, 1840.

A meeting of the brethren from different parts of the state has been appointed, to be held in this town on the 14th day of May next; when we propose to convene on the scriptural means of extending the Redeemer's kingdom, and if possible excite in the minds of our brethren a greater zeal in behalf of education.

I had the happiness a few days since, at a meeting in the vicinity of town, to receive the confession of four penitent believers—one of them the wife of our beloved brother P. T. Allen. One Baptist lady also united with us; and at the water a Methodist lady presented herself for baptism. SAMUEL. HATCH.

Georgetown, Ky., March 3, 1840.

Since I returned home from Mason and Bracken counties, where I had labored five weeks with our talented and beloved brother Moss, I found several letters from my friends and brethren in Virginia, making the most urgent appeals for a visit, to aid them in the good work of the reformation. It was suggested that I could answer through the Harbinger. I desire to say to my brethren in that quarter, that it would afford me unspeakable pleasure to be able to comply with their requests; but the necessities are so great and pressing in this state, that I cannot, at this time, give any assurance that is the least favorable. I indulge the pleasing hope that I may have it in my power to visit them. In the meantime I would say to the brethren in all quarters, stand up to the work, and resolve to engage and raise up able laborers for this glorious work. Many of our friends despaired too soon, and they attach too much importance to the labors of one man—I would say, Work on! Work on! Work on!

Brother Campbell, my judgment tells me that we should say something definite in reference to the support of Evangelists. I am convinced that the people would do their duty if it were distinctly marked out, and the appeal were made to them. I am of opinion that the Evangelists have been making the sacrifice instead of the congregations. There are many persons who suppose that four or five hundred dollars a year is a great matter for an Evangelist. If the Evangelist has a small family, let the calculation be made and see how far that sum would go towards sustaining them. I have no idea that an Evangelist should be enriched There is no danger of that. But after supporting his family as decently and as comfortably as those who are in comfortable circumstances, he should have a few hundred dollars more to lay up for his wife and children in case of his sickness or death; for you know the matter generally ends at sickness or death. What a vast harvest field is before us, and how few the reapers! Could we not obtain brother Burnet to go on to the eastward, and then to the Old World? The brethren ought to make the effort. J. T. JOHNSON.

I ask any righteous and veracious man, Whether it be right for any just, honorable, and benevolent community, to allow one of their Elders to pursue such a course as that given below, unless upon the absolute refusal of their minister to allow them to have any share in the fruits of his labors. I think either the church or its Elder ought to be called to account; for one of the parties must be selfish to a proverb. The case I put is for a comment on brother Johnson's excellent and judicious remarks; and if brother Winan's will pardon my temerity, I will give him as the author of the commentary. A. C.

Jamestown, Ohio, February 15, 1840.

I have during the winter held two meetings, of two days each, in South Charleston, 14 miles north of this place, where there are some Sceptics, and I have had good hearings. Some of them have openly acknowledged that I had nearly convinced them of the truth of the Christian religion. They are anxious to hear further on the subject; but the circumstances which surround me forbid that I should be much from home. I have a large family dependent on me for support and education. I practise medicine, and my employers dislike my leaving home lest they should need my services. I have up to this time refused to take any compensation for preaching. I have labored in word and doctrine since 1826, in this village, without receiving one cent from the brethren as a compensation; besides I have given more for building a meeting-house and for sustaining travelling proclaimers than any of the brethren, and have supported more periodicals than they all; and yet I have been of but little service to my Master. I have but few talents, and these few have not been let to as good interest as some of the worshippers of Mammon have let their money.

M. W.

Cincinnati, Ohio, March 12, 1840.

The good work is still progressing. About two hundred have been immersed, and twenty or thirty have been received by letter, &c. and some offenders restored

JAMES CHALLIS.

AN APPEAL TO THE BRETHREN.

To the Elders and faithful brethren in Christ Jesus we make an appeal ——The time has come when a sense of duty demands of all the faithful to exert their best efforts to perfect the work already begun—the work of reformation. That we have achieved much in the theory of a reformation and a return to a pure speech as Christians, is evident and cannot be denied. The old traces and landmarks have been industriously sought for, and in very many instances have been found; a taste for Bible reading and literature greatly improved and increased, while divine light and knowledge remain very far in the advance of those practical results so much to be wished and sought for by the early efforts of its original advocates. Much the largest portion of our time, perhaps, has been employed in warding off the attacks of our opponents who publicly opposed our efforts. Is it not probable that while guarding the outer walls of the temple, we have neglected the furniture within? It is not the most important duty of a General to gain an advantage over his adversary, but to secure it. To clear a field and fence it is important all will admit; but he that does that, and then sows his seed without an effort to destroy the darnel, is not more irrational and at fault, than those who wage a warfare against all the corruptions of the age, beat up for volunteers to aid in the struggle for liberty and freedom, and then leave every man to run at large without restraint of law or government. Originally three great elementary principles were recognized in the church, to wit—planting, watering, and pruning; and it is evident that in the association of these cardinal principles which, when combined and brought to bear upon the body of Christ, can we hope to find the greatest good and highest practicable improvement; the proof of which is alike seen both in the empire of Nature as well as that of Grace.

The history of the last fifteen years warrant us in the assertion that the march of Bible truth, with the overthrow of human dogmas, has rarely, if ever, had a parallel—certainly not since the days of Luther and his coadjutors. The standard of truth has been boldly and ably planted, and many of the best and noblest spirits of all parties have rallied around it. The Bible, and the Bible alone, as the only means of divine knowledge, faith, and manners, is their motto and watchword. That it is unconquerable when wielded by a skilful and wise hand, let the days past and present declare. We have seen even those who had not magnanimity enough to acknowledge their allegiance to its truth, and their co-operation with those who first set the car in motion, powerfully convulsed by its principles, too cowardly to renounce the creed and stand upon the Bible alone; and yet in possession of too much light to be at ease. The principles for which we have plead, like light, their unchanging companion, has visited every state and territory this side the Atlantic, and already is boldly plead in the Old World. But, beloved brethren, shall we stop here? Is this the highest object wished for? I hope, I trust not.

But by this time we may be asked, What lack we yet? Sorry, indeed, am I that I cannot say, as did our Master to the young man, 'One thing lack you yet' We want an altar and sacrifice in every family, preparatory to a Bible class for the study of the Holy Oracles in every congregation of disciples. We want, and must have, a more efficient and God-fearing Eldership, who will punctually attend to the good order and government of the whole congregation. That each of these principles of instruction and government are greatly wanted and imperiously called for by the whole state of Christian society, need not be labored; for it is presumed that few, if any, will controvert it. It remains to be seen whether the disciples will acknowledge the importance of the ground assumed, and whether they will lend their aid in bringing it about. All will readily grant the importance of the acquisition of knowledge; but knowledge puffeth up. In the chain of Christian perfection God has put five links, nor will he permit either an addition or diminution. Our object, beloved brethren, is clearly seen and now before you. Let him that hath ears to hear, hear. Will you lend us your aid? The Lord willing, we shall hope to meet you again the coming month.

G. W. P.

Louisville, March, 1840.

EXTRACTS FROM THE EVANGELIST.

The following notices of certain difficulties and misunderstandings occasionally alluded to in "The Evangelist," are transferred to our pages from the seventh volume of that work. They are found on pages 258 and 259, and I trust will be acceptable to those of our readers who may feel interested in the matters to which they relate. It is quite possible for persons of the purest motives and most upright intentions to differ in their opinions on the intrinsic or relative importance of certain facts and events. We are all apt to attach too much importance to our own doings, and sometimes to censure those who cannot award to us all that we ask. But timous explanations of such omissions and commissions may prevent alienations and discords, and enable those to love and co-operate as brethren who otherwise might have been severed, at least for a season, as were Paul and Barnabas. I can most cordially reciprocate the desires expressed by our brother Scott; and do most ardently wish that nothing from an insidious foe, or sycophantic friend, may henceforth occur to mar the harmony or interrupt the good feelings which have heretofore existed between us, and which should always characterize, from the least to the greatest, all who plead the cause of primitive Christianity. A. C.

Did the reader observe a few sentences in the last of my former pieces on "Our Name?" Let him be assured, then, that he will never be wounded again by the publication of any thing of a similar nature in the Evangelist. Brother Campbell and myself have had the pleasure of a long and interesting interview in Cincinnati, together with the whole estate of the Eldership there; and I am happy, extremely happy to have it in my power to inform all whom it may concern, that our difficulties, which have arisen chiefly from our taking different views of the same subjects, have been happily adjusted; and that our ancient, amiable, and Christian feelings have been restored to their wonted channel, to flow unbroken and unsullied, I trust, forever. God grant it! for sure our love for each other, like that of David and Jonathan's, has been very pleasant. May the refreshings of the Spirit of God sanctify our deep and sincere regard for each other; and to God's most holy name be endless praise through Jesus Christ.

W. S.

LETTERS FROM BROTHER CAMPBELL AND BROTHER SCOTT.

After a careful review of the whole contents and drift of the December number for 1838, of the Evangelist, as respects both myself and brother Campbell, and the events of 1823 and 1827, I sincerely regret its publication and the causes which led to it, as presenting both him and myself in an attitude before the community in which we ought not to stand, and which is calculated to do injury to us and the cause in which we have been so long co-operating, and I trust that the brethren will regard this as a pledge from my hand that the like shall not obtain again. WALTER SCOTT.

December 2d, 1839.

To the matter above referred to, after the explanations presented by our brother Scott, I consider it inexpedient to make any allusion farther than to state, that although I cannot regard any thing done by him in 1827, or myself in 1823, as a restoration of the gospel of Christ either to the church or to the world, I do consider that he practically carried out the principles of reformation as before understood and published in the Christian Baptist, and in my debate with M'Calla, particularly in the points of Faith, Repentance, and Baptism for the remission of sins, more fully and effectually, as well as more successfully, than before attempted or accomplished by any one, and in doing which, I think, he eminently advanced the cause of reformation.

A. CAMPBELL.

December 2d, 1839.

MEETING AT WELLSBURG.

A MEETING of the Messengers from churches in Harrison and Jefferson counties, Ohio; Brooke, Ohio, and Marshall counties, Va.; and Washington county, Pa., was held at Wellsburg, on Saturday, March 14th. The meeting was organized by appointing brother *Cyrus M'Neely* to preside, and *W. F. M. Arny*, Secretary.

The object of the meeting being stated, the following preamble and resolutions were adopted:—

WHEREAS an opportunity has occurred in the openings of Providence for proclaiming the apostolic gospel among the German population of our country—

1. *Resolved*, That a fund be created under the direction of a committee appointed by the churches, who will co-operate in this matter, for the purpose of sustaining a qualified brother in that field; and if the churches in this district be found unable to support such a laborer all the time, a proposition be made to some of the churches in the adjoining districts to co-operate with us in this undertaking.

2. *Resolved*, That brother *Shaffer* be the person employed at this time to labor in the aforesaid field.

3. *Resolved*, That brothers Richardson, Grafton, and Arny be a committee to carry into effect the foregoing resolutions.

4. *Resolved*, That the proceedings of this meeting be signed by the Chairman and Secretary, and published in the Harbinger.

CYRUS M'NEELY, *Chairman*.

W. F. M. ARNY, *Secretary*.

All brethren who feel able and willing to contribute for the purpose of sustaining a laborer among the Germans, are requested to forward their contributions per mail to brother W. F. M Arny, Bethany, Va., before the 1st of May next.

☞ At a meeting of Messengers from churches in Ohio, Marshall, and Brooke counties, Va., brethren A. Campbell. S. Grafton, Robert Richardson, and Robert Y. Henley were appointed to represent the churches in Western Viginia, at the state meeting, to be held in Charlottesville, on the 2d Friday in June next; and brothers A. Campbell and W. F. M. Arny were appointed a committee to correspond with the churches in Western Virginia on this subject.

ANNUAL STATE MEETINGS.

A MEETING of the brethren from different parts of Kentucky is to be held at Harrodsburg, on the 14th day of May next. At this meeting it is expected there will be a conference on the scriptural means of extending the Redeemer's kingdom throughout the state, as well as a statistical report of the condition of the churches in the whole commonwealth. Something may be also said on the best means of awaking the attention of the brethren to the great cause of intellectual and moral culture in families, and in primary and high schools.

MEETING AT CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA.

A SIMILAR annual meeting is to be held at Charlottesville, Va., commencing on the 2d Friday of June. I have promised, all things concurring, to be present at this meeting. And should the Lord permit, in 1841 I will attend the annual meetings of Indiana, Illinois, and, perhaps, Missouri, if the meetings can be appointed at proper places and intervals. I intend to visit Nashville, Te., sometime during the present year. A. C.

OBITUARY.

HARRODSBURG, Ky., March 3, 1840.

Dear brother Campbell—THE following letter was written by sister HELM, of Lincoln county, Ky., to one of our faithful laborers, (brother Nathan Waters,) of Indiana. A few days after writing it she went to Danville to hear you; and, perhaps, from too much exposure for her constitution, she was attacked with pleurisy, which in a few days translated her from the bosom of the church below to the purer society of the church above. If you have room in the Harbinger, and think it worthy of a place, you will please publish it. C. J. SMITH.

November 13th, 1839.

Beloved Brother and Sister—I take this opportunity of writing to let you know that we are all well, for which I feel truly thankful to God. I enjoy as good health as I have for many years; but I have nothing very pleasing to write as regards spiritual things. As for temporal things, we all have abundance—yea, I fear too much for our own good, unless we make a better use of them. We are expressly told we cannot serve God and Mammon. O! that we were true believers in the word of God, and would strictly adhere to the admonitions and cautions that were given to the disciples to keep them from being drawn away by the enchantments of the world! O! that we would hear what a beloved Apostle says on the subject—"Love not the world, neither the things of the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him; for all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world." Do we, that profess to be the church of Christ, believe these things? Brother Nathan, I know we are too much conformed to this world: we torture body and soul; we sacrifice peace of mind, and surrender all comforts of the body; we rise early and take rest late to keep up with the world. This will we do, and yet shrink from the exhortations that lead to eternal life. I am fully convinced we are far from the enjoyments which Christ promised to his church,

his body, the temple of the Holy Spirit. Where, I ask, shall we find this holy temple of which Paul speaks, when he says, "Know you not that you are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwells in you. If any man shall defile the temple of God, him will God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple you are." O! my beloved brother, how much do we resemble this temple! Look at the fruits that adorn it in the word of God: Love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, and fidelity, with many other graces. Yes, they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts. "If we live in the Spirit, let us walk in the Spirit: if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." This last is a sentence we ought to ponder well: it falls with weight on my mind. I awfully fear we have too much of the love of the world. We love to run after its riches, its fashions, and vanities, which are all forbidden; for they are all to perish with the using. We are also commanded to have no fellowship with "the unfruitful works of darkness; but rather reprove them." But, 'No,' say some of our brethren, 'we must not reprove too much; we shall lose our popularity and our influence in the world.' But I would ask, What right have we to seek the friendship of the world, when we are told it is at enmity with God? And sure I am the love of it prevents us enjoying the love of God, which should dwell in us without a rival? And again I would ask, What right have we to complain of difficulties, if He who was acquainted with grief has forewarned us of them and directed us how to overcome them, and promised his assistance and a great reward if we overcome? Since he has set both before us, shall we take one without the other—the wages without the labor? There is no soldier where there is no war, and no victory where there is no battle. It called for soldiers to follow Jesus in primitive Christianity, and it would require soldiers now if we lived as they did, for we would be sure to be persecuted; but we are too much like the world. It loves its own, for the world will love its own, or its like. O that the Lord would throw around us such a train of circumstances as would turn us from the love of the world to the love of God and his cause!

[I had the pleasure of an acquaintance with this excellent mother in Israel. She was, indeed, one of the excellent of the earth, and a blessing to many. Her loss to the church will be long felt. But unspeakably happy are they who fall asleep in the bosom of the Lord!—A. C.]

Died, on the 11th February, Chancy Butler, Bishop of the church of Christ, meeting on the South-West Diagonal, in the 64th year of his age; and on the 26th February died also, Mrs. Mary Butler, in her 66th year. They have left a numerous family of intelligent and respectable sons and daughters, living in different parts of the Union.

This last notice is a verification of the last words of the deceased. At parting with her husband she said in the calmest expectation of her own change, "We shall not be long separated." She had all her life delighted in the gospel which the Bible reveals; and throughout her last illness she constantly testified to the joyfulness and strength of its hopes.

These venerable decedents were of the first settlers of the state of

Indiana, and their house has been the home of many a traveller over the wilds of the North-West.

Elder B. professed the Christian religion in his youth, and became a successful proclaimer of the gospel in the Baptist church at middle age. In the latter part of his life he embraced the cause of the reformation of the church; and by his intelligence, industry, and zeal, he attained to an uncommon degree of usefulness.

The death of Elder B. is a bereavment that is deeply felt by the congregation over which he presided. In their own house of worship, only a few days before, he had delivered his last public discourse. That discourse has been remarked by many, and by the writer it will be long remembered for its impressive clearness. Although the Elder had hardly a twelve-month residence in this town, and notwithstanding the maturity of his days, his vacant place in society will be long and often mourned. But this loss is undoubtedly his gain: for "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord; yea, says the spirit, from henceforth they shall rest from their labors, and their works do follow them."

D. E. A.

☞ Numerous communications on hand are necessarily deferred. Along with our series of essays on Difficulties in Churches and Discipline, Specimens of Sophistry, Questions and Definitions, a Mercenary Spirit, and a Prospectus for the *Journal of Christianity*, to be edited by brother Nathaniel Field, Jeffersonville, Indiana—of which more particularly in our next.

☞ I have not seen a Biblical Recorder for seven months. The reason why I cannot tell.

A. C.

EXTRACT FROM A POEM

Delivered at the departure of the Senior Class of Yale College, in 1836.

BY N. P. WILLIS.

We shall go forth together. There will come
Alike the day of trial unto all,
And the rude world will buffet us alike.
Temptation hath a music for all ears,
And mad ambition trumpeteth to all;
And the ungovernable thought within
Will be in every bosom eloquent.
But when the silence and the calm come on,
And the high seal of character is set,
We shall not all be similar. The scale
Of being is a graduated thing;
And deeper than the vanities of power,
Or the vain pomp of glory; there is writ,
Gradation in its hidden characters.
The pathway to the grave may be the same;
And the proud man shall tread it, and the low,
With his bowed head, shall bear him company.
Decay will make no difference, and Death
With his cold hand will make no difference;
And there will be no precedence of power
In waking at the coming trump of God.
But in the temper of the invisible mind,
The godlike and undying intellect,
There are distinctions that will live in heav'n,
When time is a forgotten circumstance.
The elevated brow of kings will lose
The impress of regalia; and the slave
Will wear his immortality as free
Beside the crystal waters; but the depth
Of glory in the attributes of God,
Will measure the capacities of mind;

And as the angels differ, will the ken
Of gifted spirits glorify him more.
It is life's mystery. The soul of man
Createth its own destiny of power,
And as the trial is intenser here,
His being hath a nobler strength in heaven.——
What is its earthly victory? Press on!
For it hath tempted angels. Yet press on!
For it shall make you mighty among men;
And from the eyrie of your eagle thought
Ye shall look down on monarchs. O press on!
For the high ones and powerful shall come
To do you reverance; and the beautiful
Will know the purer language of your brow,
And read it in a talisman of love.
Press on! for it is godlike to unloose the spirit,
And forget yourself in thought;
Bending a pinion for the deeper sky,
And in the very fetters of your flesh
Mating with the pure essences of heaven!
Press on!—"for in the grave there is no work,
And no device." Press on while yet you may!
So lives the soul of man. It is the thirst
Of his immortal nature, and he rends
The rocks for secret fountains, and pursues
The path of the illimitable wind
For mysteries;—and this is human pride!
There is a gentler element, and man
May breathe it with a calm unruffled soul,
And drink its living waters till his heart
Is pure;—and this is human happiness!
Its secret and its evidence are writ
In the broad book of Nature. 'Tis to have
Attentive and believing faculties;
To go abroad rejoicing in the joy
Of beautiful and well created things;
To love the voice of waters, and the sheen
Of silver fountains leaping to the sea;
To thrill with the rich melody of birds,
Living their life of music; to be glad
In the gay sunshine; reverent in the storm;
To see a beauty in the stirring leaf
And find calm thought beneath the whisp'ring tree;
To see, and hear, and breathe the evidence
Of God's deep wisdom in the natural world.
It is to linger on "the magic face
Of human beauty," and from light and shade
Alike to draw a lesson; 'tis to love
The cadences of voices that are tuned
By majesty and purity of thought;
To gaze on woman's beauty as a star
Whose purity and distance make it fair,
And in the gush of music to be still,
And feel that it hath purified the heart!
It is to love all virtue for itself,
All nature for its breathing evidence;
And when the eye hath seen, and when the ear
Hath drunk the beautiful harmony of the world,
It is to humble the imperfect mind,
And lean the broken spirit upon God.
Thus would I, like a just departing child,
Who lingers on the threshold of his home,—
Remember the best lesson of these lips
Whose accents shall be with us now no more.
It is the gift of sorrow to be pure;
And I would press the lesson; that when life
Hath become a weariness, and hope
Thirsts for serener waters, go abroad
Upon the paths of Nature, and when all
Its voices whisper, and its silent things
Are breathing the deep beauty of the world,
Kneel at its simple altar, and the God,
Who hath the *living waters*, shall be there.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

NEW SERIES.

VOLUME IV.——NUMBER V.

BETHANY, VA. *MAY*, 1840.

A MERCENARY SPIRIT.

Behold we have forsaken all and followed thee: what shall we have, therefore?
Matth. xix. 27.

One of the noblest attributes of the perfect Christian is that generous spirit of self-devotion which prompts him to an unreserved and implicit submission to the divine pleasure. Delayed by no cold and doubtful calculations of selfish interest, he is impelled to action by its influence, as by the irresistible force of an instinct which outstrips reason both in readiness and accuracy. With the innocent and undoubting confidence of childhood, he commits himself to the divine guidance; and, while he hears only to believe; indifferent to consequences, he believes only to obey. Obstacles are no longer feared; impossibilities no longer exist, when Intellect is borne upon the wings of Faith to the bosom of the Infinite, and Feebleness rests with security upon the arm of Omnipotence.

It is this spirit, which, like the fountain in the desert, creates, amid life's arid sands, the green spots where the weary and the heavy-laden find repose and consolation. Bursting through the barriers which would restrain it, and cheering with its joyous and unfailing stream the way to the heavenly country, it ever flows for others, not for itself; it seeks to bless, not to be blessed; to give, rather than to receive. Yet, after all, it is from the hard and barren rock of human selfishness, that this living water is made to flow by the agency of a principle as constant as it is supreme. Touched by the rod of divine power, the adamantine walls are cleft asunder, and the current of the affections, pure and free, springs forth toward heaven and thence descends to earth. Selfishness is enlarged into self-love; self-love, exalted and enlightened, becomes the source of love to God; and the love of God

issues in the love of men. Thus the highest evidence of true self-love is self-renunciation; and he only manifests a proper regard for himself, who gives himself away to God.

Nothing, on the contrary, can be more at variance with Christian character, and inimical to true happiness, than a mercenary disposition. He who is under its dominion is encased in the obduracy of an unchanged nature. From his flinty heart no gladsome fountain gushes; and neither the fruits nor flowers of human sympathy can grow where unrelenting sterility resists both the showers and the sunshine of heaven. He stands alone, like the genius of the moral wilderness by which he is surrounded; to which he is bound by no tie but that immobility which springs from his own ponderousness. Such an individual neither receives nor imparts a blessing; and is no less regardless of the interests of others, than really insensible to his own.

So foreign to true religion is this spirit, that it seems at first not a little strange that they should ever be found associated even in appearance. Yet it is to be feared that many in this age of traffic and speculation embrace religion itself just as they would some worldly advantage—from mere mercenary motives. A profession of religion, they think, will secure to them a higher degree of influence among men. It will also, they imagine, relieve them from those fears of the future which they are not at all times able to repress. In the mean time its promises, couched in the glowing language and brilliant imagery of eastern metaphor, dazzle their imaginations, and flatter their hopes of aggrandizement. They resolve to close with its offers, and all that remains is to choose, among the different parties, the one which presents the most advantages and the fewest inconveniencies. The disjointed state of Christendom affords to each one a favorable opportunity to gratify his peculiar *penchant*. Which is most popular? Which imposes the fewest restraints upon pride and passion? Which has the greatest toleration for worldly-mindedness? Which offers, upon the cheapest terms, a quiet conscience? Having made these inquiries, and having, like a judicious merchant, adjusted the account of profit and loss, and considered not only what he would gain, but what he would lose, he comes to a decision, and takes a costly pew, or a plain free-seat, as pride or economy shall have gained the ascendant. Truly, the soul of such an individual is too sordid to appreciate the unbounded generosity and philanthropy of the gospel. His intellect is too much cramped by the fetters of habitual selfishness to comprehend the true meaning of its rewards, or to regard its promises in any other light than as so many incentives to his cupidity; and his eye is too long accustomed to the narrow horizon of a mean and grovelling ambition, to

realize or enjoy the lofty elevation and boundless prospect which it offers to his view.

This mercenary spirit, however, if found more frequently and in a higher degree among those who remain thus wholly ignorant of the true character of the gospel, is to be observed occasionally, in smaller measure, even among those who are far from being either unacquainted with its purposes, or disobedient to its commands. The feeble influence of the loftier principles of human nature, so long dormant, and as yet scarce awakened to vigorous exertion, is insufficient to counteract the force of habit with entire success. A native obtuseness of the sensibilities—an intrinsic deficiency in the faculties of the soul, may, in other cases, account for its appearance, and will possibly, where the disposition is at least equal to the ability, constitute its apology. Or an error of judgment from wrong associations, imperfect knowledge, or indistinct apprehensions of the spiritual nature of the new institution, may permit the current of misplaced desire to flow in its accustomed channels. For the Christian religion closes not the ever-springing fountains of human affections and desires. It only controls their action and directs their streams. 'Do not your alms-deeds in public,' says its Author, 'that you may receive applause of men; but perform them secretly, that your Father in heaven may reward you openly; that you may obtain a higher and still more public approval. Amass not for yourselves inferior and perishable treasures upon earth, but lay up real and unfailing riches amidst the inviolable security of the heavens.' It is the same vessel, impelled by the same breeze, but directed by a more skilful pilot, to a safer harbor. So sudden is the change, that the ship is at first often driven in an opposite direction; nor is it until experience has adjusted the canvass, that she pursues her course with steadiness. It is the same compass from which the metallic attraction is suddenly withdrawn. The needle passes tremulously from West to East, and does not for a time yield to the true and heavenly impulse which guides it finally to the North.

In the case of the young convert who is in some degree influenced by a mercenary spirit, the confusion of feelings and motives attendant upon his novitiate, has not yet been reduced to order by the supremacy of the love of God. This has not yet become the ruling principle of his soul; and the consequence is, that his actions spring from mixed motives, some of which are inferior and unworthy. Such a one looks too much to the rewards of obedience. The remission of sins has been to him merely the bait which has lured him to baptism. Present privileges, honors, and enjoyments become to him the great matters of religion. He loses sight of the true objects and tendencies of the

gospel, and it is with difficulty that he is at length brought really under the influence of its higher and loftier principles.

That the first disciples of our Lord, from ignorance of the true nature of his kingdom, were greatly under the control of worldly and selfish motives, is a matter familiar to the reader of the New Testament. It was to correct their error, that he delivered to them the parable of the laborers in the vineyard, (Matth xx.) in which he reproves these cold, calculating, and envious dispositions; and then shows that, in the divine administration, those who are possessed of them shall be last rewarded, and least esteemed. Those laborers who stipulated and covenanted with the master of the vineyard for a certain sum before they would venture to engage in his service, represent those who are too much governed by selfish and interested motives, and who are readily induced thereby to become jealous of others, who, possessed of better principles, do, in the sequel, receive a greater reward. Those laborers, however, who at various periods of the day, went with prompt alacrity to labor at the saying of the Master, that 'they should receive what was right;' who did not stop to chaffer about wages, which they might have done with more reason than the first, seeing that the day was partly spent; but, on the contrary, left their compensation with unhesitating confidence to the honor and justice of their employer, represent those who commit themselves unreservedly to the divine guidance, and leave the rewards to his righteous and faithful adjudication. All, it is true, were recompensed; for our Lord had, when Peter first inquired what they should receive, informed him that every one who forsook any thing on his account should be fully remunerated. But, to correct the motive which dictated the question, he proceeds to show that a confiding, uncalculating, and obedient disposition would commend the possessor to greater rewards and higher honors. While, therefore, we would not say that those who come to baptism solely that they may obtain the remission of sins, will not obtain it; provided they be free from the gross and condemning error that they *earn* or *merit* pardon by obedience; nor that those who labor and toil in the Lord's vineyard for a present or stipulated reward, shall not receive it; we may confidently affirm, that those who come to baptism, or to any of the institutions of Heaven, in an humble, obedient, and confiding spirit, leaving it to God what they shall receive; or who labor diligently for the Lord from higher motives than an eager desire for gain, shall be first and best rewarded, and the most approved amongst the called. Thus a kind and judicious father looks with greater complacency and affection upon such of his children as obey him with readiness from the overruling force of filial dutifulness and affection. But he regards with

inferior kindness those who can be moved to obedience only by the stimulus of a promised reward. Those he honors highly and rewards liberally: these he dismisses with their specified recompense, and a merited reproof. R. R.

BAPTISM.

[A part of the essay on Fasting, left unfinished in our last, intended for this number, was unintentionally committed to the flames by our compositor in cleering his docket of what he supposed already printed. We regret the loss, as will no doubt the reader; but for our consolation we have the reflection that many worthy persons and excellent things have also perished in the flames.—A. C]

Reader, I am drawing to a close. Have patience with me. If you have understood the object of these essays, you will be edified; but if you have prejudged and decided that the intention of these essays was *controversy*, you have been most uncandid, and have greatly erred. A wish was intimated in the beginning of the series to set forth the ordinances in a *moral* point of view, free alike from the stupid adoration paid to them on the one hand, and the unmeaning nothingness attached to them, on the other. I wish primarily to benefit my brethren and myself; for I think that multitudes of my brethren look upon the ordinances not as *means*, but as *ends!* But, secondarily, I wish to obviate the difficulties of *Sceptics*, of Quakers, and of all who regard these ordinances as "unmeaning ceremonies!" Here let me say, and I wish to say it with emphasis, the Creator never gave to man an institution or ordinance which was, in the common acceptation of that phrase, a "positive ordinance;" I mean something *purely arbitrary*. The ordinances are all *moral*—all *rational*. The Creator never spoke more arbitrarily than when he said to Moses as he turned to come down from Sinai, "See that thou make all things according to the pattern showed thee in the mount;" yet even here a reason is given us. This "worldly sanctuary" was "the type of the true holy place which the Lord pitched, and not man." That the Lord has a *right* to command us, and withhold, at the same time, the *reason*, we all admit; but I devoutly thank my heavenly Father that he has so condescended to my *wishes* and my *weakness* as to give me a *reason* for every thing he has required of me. I love my Saviour with my whole heart that he has not treated me as "a slave," by sternly commanding me, and yet withholding a reason. "I call you no longer *slaves*, (*doulous;*) for the slave knoweth not what his master doeth. But I have called you *friends*, because all things which I have heard of my Father I have *made known unto you.*"

I wish now to show that baptism is a *rational* and a *moral* institution. (If my Presbyterian brethren would *listen* to me, I could show them that infant sprinkling was *irrational* and *immoral*.) I again repeat my motto, even though a fastidious reader should say it has become threadbare, viz.—"The state of the heart is the all in all in our religion." Does the reader ask, 'Why, then, the necessity of any outward act of obedience?' I answer, first, that we may detect the state of the heart; for 'it is deceitful above all things.' We can only know the tree 'by its fruit.' Here I beg leave to say that the declaration of the popular creeds, that, "the doctrine of justification by *faith alone* is a wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort." I say this doctrine is *absurd* in *theory*, and *false* in *fact*. It is an unwholesome doctrine and very full of misery. It is a doctrine of darkness and doubts! In proof of this I could fill a volume from the experience of believers in the doctrine. I shall, however, take but one specimen—an illustrious specimen! Mrs. Harriet Newel, who in the morning of life, at the early age of 18, sacrificed every consideration of friends and kindred—of ease and affluence—all earthly prospects, for the purpose of carrying the "lamp of life" to the benighted heathen; yet, with all her self-denial and pure zeal, she thus writes in a letter to Mrs. Judson about two months before her death: "Since I left you my mind has been variously exercised. I have had many distressing conflicts and doubts. But at some blessed seasons I think I have enjoyed the light of Immanuel's countenance, and have known joys too great to be expressed." Mr Newel, also, in giving an account of her last illness to her mother, after mentioning some conversation which they had together when they first began to consider her disease as likely to prove fatal, he says, "She told me she had some *doubts* respecting her state, and wished me to examine her closely, and to converse constantly on the momentous subject of experimental religion." Had this amiable, devoted, and self-denying disciple of the blessed Jesus understood the ordinances of the gospel, she would have "rejoiced in the Lord always," even "with joy unspeakable and full of glory." But although she had "many distressing doubts" concerning *herself*, yet I feel sure that no one acquainted with her whole history could have any doubts concerning her; and I rejoice also that these doubts all passed away from her mind before her death—her sun did not set behind a cloud. But in the midst of her doubts and distress what would a *scriptural assurance of pardon* have been worth to her? Yet it would not have affected her *character*, but only her *enjoyment*.

Not three years since I visited a community of the most humble, devotional, benevolent, and self-denying people I ever saw; yet in

their conversation and prayers they showed that they little understood the ordinances of the gospel. To have spoken to them of a *scriptural assurance of pardon* would have been the language of a Barbarian. I could but think to myself that this was all they wanted to make them the happiest people on earth. The ordinance of baptism is full of meaning! It was ordained by divine wisdom. Our Lord requires first of all humility and self-denial. "Except you repent and become as a little child, you shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven." "Except a man deny himself and take up his cross, he cannot be my disciple." Can we conceive of an institution so calculated to call forth these attributes, if possessed; or to create them, if lacking. But it is also a test of our faith, (for "we are justified by faith;") and I thank our heavenly Father that he has given us, as a test of our faith, an ordinance that is exceedingly humiliating. A man will not be likely to go into the watery grave to worship Faustosus.* Indeed, I am quite sure that I have seen scores of persons—aye, and professing Christians too—who would sooner be burnt at the stake than be buried in the grave of Jesus. Would heaven be a place of happiness to such persons? Nay, verily; it would be "the severest part of hell!" When I witness scenes of great religious excitement, and see the benevolent efforts that are made to arouse sinners to a sense of their danger; when I hear sinners crying, "What shall we do to be saved?" and hear the leaders of the people tell them to humble themselves before the Lord—to repent—to believe—I am pained at the heart that these distressed inquirers have not some *sensible test* by which to decide, both as to quantity and quality of the faith, repentance, and humility required. If I could speak to them, I would say, If your faith causes you to hate sin and embrace Jesus as your Saviour, and leads you to the place where he has recorded his name, you have saving faith; if your repentance leads you to "cease to do evil and learn to do well;" if it leads you to "put on the Lord Jesus Christ," (in the ordinance of his appointment,) "and make no provision for the flesh to fulfil the lusts thereof—then your repentance is evangelical. If your humility leads you to bow down and worship at the foot of the cross, and lay yourselves low in the tomb—then the Saviour will exalt you. "The preacher has been exhorting us to humble ourselves," said a young man to his mother, as he came home from a scene of religious excitement, "and I can think of no place where I should feel so humble as in the grave of Jesus; and there I am resolved to go."

We require sensible signs in order to the "assurance of the understanding. The gracious Lord has always given an external *sign*, or

* The demon of pride.

token, to confirm every covenant which he has made with man, whether an individual or a nation. When he drove out Cain from his presence, "a groaner and a troubler," when Cain fears that vengeance will overtake him, and retributive justice be meted out to him by every one he meets, even to him the Lord gives a promise and confirms it with "a sign." "And the Lord gave Cain a sign," &c.* He also gave Noah a sign that the earth should no more be covered with a flood of waters. But the *moral* effects of baptism are four-fold. First, it developes the state of the heart; it tests our faith, our repentance, our humility. Second, it gives assurance to the mind, it gives rest to the conscience by giving a *formal* acquittal from guilt. I say *formal*, for I believe that the sins of every person who is a fit subject of baptism, are *really* forgiven before baptism. I thus believe, because, as has been shown at large in former essays, no action has, in itself, any inherent character. *It is the state of mind prompting to the action that gives character to the action.* Thirdly, baptism has a very direct tendency to moral purity in the formation of character. The man who goes forth from his dwelling, conscious that he is wholly clean in person and apparel, will be very cautious about coming in contact with mire and filth; but the man, whose garments are already *unclean*, has no such restraint. But a clean man may forget that *he is clean*, and defile himself. *Children* are very apt to forget this. Thus the mother often chides her truant boy, as he returns bespattered and besmeared, "Were not your clothes white and clean in the morning?" And thus does the Apostle Peter chide the man who lacks the virtues of which he has been speaking—who does not keep himself pure: "He has forgotten that he was *purged* from his old sins" (in his baptism.)

But, fourth, we take upon us vows and obligations in our baptism which we will feel to be binding upon us so long as we have either faith or conscience. This is of immense importance in the formation of character. Take, for illustration, as Paul has done, the marriage covenant: Two persons may be ardently attached to each other; but if there be no interchange of vows—no plighted faith, these affections may be suffered to languish and die: but if their faith be plighted publicly at the altar, every principle of faith and honor conspires to prompt them to *cherish* those affections. So of baptism. We here make "the good profession in the presence of many witnesses."

To sum up the whole matter, then, upon this subject, baptism is for the eviction or demonstration of our faith, our repentance, our humility. It is a basis of confidence, which, without a sensible sign, we could

* The common version. "And the Lord set a mark on Cain," &c. This would seem to be the most likely means of bringing upon him the deprecated vengeance.

not have. Multitudes have wholly renounced their profession because, when they grew cold, and their love and zeal abated, they were led to think they had been wholly deceived—that they "never knew any thing about religion." But this can never be with a person who has understandingly been baptized "for the remission of sins." Those who come to the place where the Lord has recorded his name, have a "thus saith the Lord" for the forgiveness of their sins. This places them beyond the power of doubt or temptation on this subject. Blessed be the Lord for this condescending love! But we are also prompted by the consciousness of purity and forgiveness, and also by the most solemn vows are bound to *keep* ourselves pure Baptism is the act of naturalization in the Christian kingdom; it is the marriage ceremony by which we are united to Christ; it is the act of *engrafting* into "the true vine;" it is "the *door*" into the fold of "the good Shepherd;" for we are baptized *into* Christ; it is the starting point in the Christian race; it is the act of enlistment in the "Army of the Faith;" the putting on of the soldier's uniform; it is the laver at the threshhold of the temple, where we wash before we offer "spiritual sacrifice acceptable to God." "And what shall I say more?" Alas! that the people should have lost sight of this heavenly institution—that they should have been made to forget the place where the Lord has recorded his name! And what shall be done to the "Jeroboam" who has erected altars "at Bethel, and at Dan,"* and told the people that they can have the forgiveness of their sins there as well as at Jerusalem where the Lord has recorded his name.

What now remains for me but to briefly notice the Lord's supper and the Lord's day; but the latter I have already considered, (unintentionally however,) under the head of "FASTING." I shall next proceed to consider the institution of

THE LORD'S SUPPER.

And O! that I could speak of this heavenly institution as I ought!

"O! thou my heart inspire
Who touch'd Isaiah's hallow'd lips with fire!"

It is the Christian's "passover;" and what lover of the Lord will not say with David, "I was glad when it was said to me, Come, let us go up to the house of the Lord"? It is the memorial of a Saviour's dying love; it is his parting gift to his friends; it is the Christian's keepsake, and with what love and adoration should we celebrate this feast!

"O how shall words, with equal warmth,
The gratitude declare,
That glows within my ravish'd heart,
But thou canst read it there."

The mourning bench and the anxious seat.

My brothers, let us remember the dying love of our Lord; let us remember that "we are not our own—we are bought with a price." "Wherefore glorify God with your bodies and your spirits, which are his." "You know the grace of our Lord, that though he was rich, yet, for our sakes, he became poor, that we, through his poverty, might be made rich."

"He left his starry crown,
And laid his robes aside,
On wings of love came down,
And wept, and bled, and died.
What he endured, O who can tell,
To save our souls from death and hell!"

He came down to earth that he might raise us to heaven—he endured grief and scorn that we might inherit joy and bliss—he wore a crown of thorns that we might wear a crown of glory. Let us praise him forever. CHRISTIANOS.

FAMILY CULTURE.

CONVERSATIONS AT THE CARLTON HOUSE.

No. V.

The fifth chapter of Genesis being read, on Wednesday morning all the household being present, Olympas continued his instructions in the following manner;—

Olympas. Here, in the compass of a few periods, we have the book or record of the generations or descendants of Adam for one thousand six hundred and fifty-six years—from the creation down to the birth of Shem, Ham, and Japheth. Now although this appears to us rather a barren subject, being a mere record of births and deaths and the interval between them, when properly considered, it becomes a very useful and edifying section of sacred scripture, and a fruitful source of many religious sentiments and emotions. Let us, therefore, examine it with care. Tell me, Susan, which branch of Adam's family is written in this chapter?

Susan. Abel's: for we had Cain's yesterday.

Olympas. Was not Abel killed by his brother; and having no account of his marriage or his offspring, how can we regard this chapter as containing an account of his branch of Adam's family?

Susan. Seth was born to fill Abel's place.

Olympas. Yes, I taught you to consider the name and reputation of the protomartyr as preserved in Seth's person and family, inasmuch as

Eve said, "God has appointed me *another seed instead of Abel* whom Cain slew." In these words our mother Eve shows her faith in the first promise that 'her seed should bruise the serpent's head.' She looked for the promise through Abel, and not through the wicked Cain; and seeing him slain for his faith, she received *Seth* in the faith that God through him would fulfil all that she expected through the righteous Abel. Her confidence was not vain: for the only lineage of Messiah on earth, in fact or in form, is found in the line of Seth.

Olympas. What, Henry, did I tell you means the name *Seth*?

Henry. "THE APPOINTED."

Olympas. The name itself, then, indicates what was in the mind and expectation of Eve. This was the person appointed to fill up the promise which she had expected through Abel. Repeat, William, the names of the sons of Adam and Eve in this line down to the flood, as given in this chapter.

William. Adam, Seth, Enos, Cainan, Mahalaleel, Jared, Enoch, Methuselah, Lamech, Noah.

Olympas. What came of the other descendants of these families? For example, had Seth no son but Enos, and Enos no son but Cainan, &c.?

William. It is not only presumable, but certain that they had. But as you told us, the Bible is formed on the plan of giving the history of only one family from Adam to Jesus of Nazareth; and only so much of every other family is given as is necessary to present this one fairly before us.

Olympas. Very true; Cain's family all perished in the deluge, as did all Seth's offspring save Noah and his family. We have, therefore, only the ancestry of our Lord through ten generations in this chapter. How old, James, was Adam when Seth was born.

James. One hundred and thirty years.

Olympas. How old, Susan, was Adam when he died?

Susan. Nine hundred and thirty.

Olympas. Who of all the antediluvians attained the greatest age?

James. Methuselah lived to be nine hundred and sixty nine.

Olympas. Tell me, Reuben, in what year of the world did he die?

Reuben. He died in the year 1656, just before the flood.

Olympas. He must then have lived a long time contemporary with Adam, and no doubt often conversed with the father of all mankind. Explain to us, Reuben, how long Methuselah may have conversed with Adam.

Reuben. Seth was born in the year of Adam 130; Enos, in the year 235; Cainan, in the year 325; Mahalaleel, in the year 395; Jared, in the

year 460; Enoch, in the year 632; and Methuselah in the year 687; which sum taken from 930, the whole age of Adam, leaves 243 years in which they lived and may have conversed together. This may again be shown by subtracting 969 from 1656; that is, the whole life of Methuselah from the whole period before the flood, which leaves 687 for the nativity of Methuselah 243 years before the death of Adam.

Olympas. So then all the experience of Adam was communicated to Noah and his three sons *by one person*. For if Noah was 500 years old at the deluge, and Shem 98, as we are informed, then the entire history of all time reached Shem, Ham, and Japheth by one person; corroborated, indeed, by innumerable vouchers. For when we say one person, we do not mean one witness; but that one person only was necessary, because he that for two hundred and forty-three years talked with Adam, talked with Noah 500 years; with Shem, ninety-eight; with Ham, one hundred; and with Japheth, at least one hundred and two years. But he conversed with many others of his own ancestors and descendants besides these, and they with one another; so that the true faith and the true history of all time were most carefully and safely kept to the deluge by a few chosen spirits. Who, Susan, was the father of Methuselah?

Susan. Enoch, who was translated.

Olympas. What mean you by translation, James?

James. To be translated is to be carried from one world or place to another. Enoch did not die, but his body was carried up into heaven.

Olympas. Can you, Edward, name any allusion to this subject in the New Testament explanatory of it?

Edward. Paul says to the Hebrews, chap. xi. "By faith Enoch was translated that he might not see death; and was not found, because God had translated him: for before his translation he had this testimony that he pleased God."

Olympas. This translation of Enoch is a truly grand and important event, and must be well understood by you all. He was taken up into heaven, body, soul, and spirit, without sickness or death, as you understand it, Edward?

Edward. I suppose he was *changed* some way before he entered heaven; inasmuch as Paul says, "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God: neither doth corruption inherit incorruption."—Enoch, then, must have been changed in a moment, as will be all that are alive at the coming of the Lord. "They shall be caught up into the clouds," as Enoch was translated to heaven without the sensation of death.

Olympas. The translation of Enoch is a whole volume in itself

was a gospel and a revelation of a future and happy life to those who had honesty and capacity to consider it well. It must have been a soul-absorbing and thrilling question, *Whither went Enoch?* Do you think, Edward, there was any search made for him?

Edward. They certainly made search for him, as it is affirmed that "he was not found." Had they not looked for him, they could not have said this.

Olympas. Do you, Edward, remember a similar search for a Prophet that was lost?

Edward. It is said, I believe, that they searched three days for Elijah after God had taken him up in a whirlwind into heaven.

Olympas. True: and the spirit, or wind, from the Lord "suddenly caught away Philip the Evangelist;" but "he *was found* at Azotus." Enoch was not found, because God had translated him. But you have not told us, Edward, how the translation of Enoch demonstrated a future and a happy life.

Edward. The character that was translated imports future happiness: for if "walking with God" and being "perfect" are the ways of blessedness, surely one pre-eminent in these, snatched away from earth to heaven, fully indicates a state of blessedness consequent upon removal from these coasts of mortality.

Olympas. Be it granted, then I ask at what time did this event transpire—before or after the death of Seth, Abel's substitute?

Edward. Before the death of Seth. Enoch was born in the year of Adam 622, and died in the year of the world 987, fifty-five years before Seth died; for all the days of Seth, born in the year 130, were nine hundred and twelve years.

Olympas. This is the point to which I have been leading your attention. The translation of Enoch happened so early as that all the sons of Adam in our Lord's ancestry had the advantage of it. On the sacred page, so far as written document goes, the first man that left this world was slain—the second died—the third was translated. Murder, death, and translation follow close in the succession of history. if not in actual fact—in these three good men, Abel, Adam, Enoch.

Olympas. What, Reuben, was the profession or calling of Enoch?

Reuben. Enoch was a prophet and a saint. He "walked with God, and it is said "he prophesied." He was a preacher and a saint.

Olympas. Do we know any thing about the sermons of Enoch?

Reuben. Jude alludes to the book of Enoch; at least he says that Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied, saying, "Behold the Lord comes with his myriads of holy angels to pass sentence upon

all, and to convict all the ungodly among them of all their deeds of ungodliness which they have impiously committed, and of all the hard things which ungodly sinners have spoken against him."

Olympas. From this sermon or text of Enoch how many distinct subjects of revelation are intimated, Eliza?

Eliza. The coming of the Lord—the existence of myriads of holy angels—the providence and supervision of God—human responsibility—a general judgment—and the punishment of the wicked. If each of these may be regarded as a distinct topic, then there were some six or seven very fundamental matters revealed and taught ever since the fall of man.

Olympas. If to the altar, the priest, the sacrifice, the sabbath, we add that knowledge of the principles of general piety and morality which enabled Enoch to walk with God, and to be perfect in his generation; I say, if to these we add his teachings, much more light and knowledge of the being and perfections of God—of his creation, providence, and redemption—the principles of righteousness and piety—of future rewards and punishments, was communicated and possessed in the first ages of the world, than many now seem to imagine. Of all which the translation of Enoch was a seal and confirmation difficult fully to appreciate. Tell me, Thomas Dilworth, what think you would be the most likely train of reflections to which such an event would give rise?

Thomas. That man is predestined to live again; at least susceptible of a new life in some other world than this. That the transition from this state to that is rapid and direct, and that the virtuous and morally excellent will, on quitting these confines of mortality, be admitted into the presence of the Lord; for it is implied that God took Enoch to himself.

Olympas. Is it then presumable that Abel, and Enoch, and Adam, who died in faith, were all taken to the Lord?

Thomas. Being all the children of men and the sons of God, I know no reason nor scripture that forbids the idea of their all going to one place.

Olympas. Paul says, "Absent from the body, and present with the Lord." But as Enoch was not absent from the body, could he be present with the Lord in the same sense as Abel?

Thomas. The ten thousand angels of whom Enoch preached were present with the Lord. But while in the presence of the Lord there is fulness of joy, there are many ways of being in his presence. We in this family are all in your presence at this time; yet we are not all standing in the same relations, nor performing the same services. I

think that Gabriel, Enoch, and Abel are equally in the presence of God, though not sustaining the same rank, nor performing the same services; and though all happy in the ratio of their several capacities, yet differing in these as much as we do who now surround your fireside and enjoy the light of your countenance and instructions.

Olympas. I believe, Thomas, your views are substantially correct and scriptural; for Elijah who was translated, and Moses that died and was buried, appear in the same company, performing the same mission on Mount Tabor; while Peter, James, and John enjoyed their company and heard their communications with each other and the Lord, while conversing about his death at Jerusalem, then soon to happen.

Thomas. It was your remarks on that scene and on 2 Col. v. 1—5., that led me to these views and conclusions concerning the righteous dead. But may I ask, for instruction, what difference was there in the character of Abel, Enoch, and Noah, that should have occasioned such a difference in their end. Abel was slain, Enoch translated, and Noah died, and yet all were *perfect* in their generation? You say there are no degrees in perfection; and why this difference?

Olympas. But, Edward, are we agreed that these three were all equally excellent persons.

Edward. Paul says, By *faith* Abel offered—by faith Enoch was translated—and by faith Noah prepared an ark. They all walked by faith.

Olympas. Still others as well as these walked by faith, who were in moral excellence much their inferiors—such as Samson, Barak, Gideon, &c.

Edward. But more is said of Abel, Enoch, and Noah than of those three; for Abel obtained witness that he was *righteous.* Noah was declared to be *perfect*, and Enoch *walked with God.* Now it would appear that they were equally perfect men: for if God said in fact that Abel was *righteous*, and Noah *perfect*, and Enoch *walked mith him;* they were doubtless of equal moral worth, differing only in times, circumstances and things purely accidental.

Olympas. So let it be. It will then follow that the wise and benevolent ends of the Father of all required that Abel should be a martyr—that Enoch should carry his own body into heaven—and that Noah should be the saviour of a world. The universe required these three distinct services; while the three servants having done their work, were equally acceptable to God—equally perfect in their generation and circumstances; and are now equally, though diversely, blessed in he presence chamber of the King the Lord of hosts. "One star

differeth from another star in glory;" while all are stars in the same heavens, made of the same matter, and serving the same God. Eliza, was not Enoch a *prophet?*

Eliza. So Jude would intimate: for he says, "Enoch the seventh from Adam prophesied."

Olympas. Of what, Eliza, did he especially prophesy?

Eliza. Of the coming of the Lord with his angels to judge the world and to avenge his enemies.

Olympas. It is, then, indubitable that the doctrine of a future life, the consummation of all things—the doctrine of the origin and destiny of man, was taught from the earliest ages of the world. The translation of Enoch was a demonstration of its truth, and a confirmation of its certainty vouchsafed to all the renowned fathers of mankind before the death of Seth the immediate son of Adam. Did not I request you, Reuben, on a former occasion, to trace the history of tradition, and from the Bible to determine through how many hands the knowledge possessed by the ancients was communicated to Moses?

Reuben. You did, sir. And from the tabular view which I have completed on this subject, I find that all the knowledge, natural and supernatural, which man enjoyed in the first 2000 years of the world came to Isaac *through but two persons.* Indeed, I have satisfied myself that all nations had one common fountain of knowledge, and that one universal tradition obtained through Methuselah and Shem.

Olympas. This is both curious and edifying; but we must defer the farther investigation of this subject till the evening.

A. C.

MORALITY OF CHRISTIANS—*No. XIX.*

THE other day, Mr. Editor, I passed an American eagle and a Spanish doubloon to a countryman for value received, as I had given full value for them. True, I had heard from a gentleman broker that they were of suspicious character, and probably base metal, merely baptized in gold. But as I did not certainly know that they were base coins, ought I to have offered them to persons who were not judges of them without any intimation of the report? I also passed in silence a $50 bank note of doubtful character to a farmer, which I had unsuspectingly received in a fair sale of the necessaries of life; but not *knowing* it to be a counterfeit, I did not altogether condemn myself, especially as I said nothing in commendation of it. But on reading some of your remarks on Christian morality, though not on this subject, I fear I have done wrong. Pray what is your opinion?

My opinion is that you did a moral wrong. You have not done to another what you would have done to you. You would have thanked the person who offered you that suspicious money to have intimated to you simply what he had heard of it; for in that case you would not have taken it. An omission of that duty, which fair and honorable dealing demanded from you, subjected him to the actual loss of the whole amount of your debt; as, perhaps, under all the circumstances of the case he could never have recourse to you, not knowing from whom he received it.

But I did not know from whom I received that money, and I must have lost it forever if it had been returned to me.

Well, you ought to have lost it unless you could return it to the person from whom you received it. The moment that a doubt was created in your mind of its genuineness, it behooved you, on any attempt to pass it, to state that doubt fully on the presentation of it to an unsuspecting person; otherwise you are, on all the principles of morality and truth, fraudulently taking from your neighbor his property. Your not examining the matter fully also proves that you were suspicious, or fearful of the truth of the report; and, therefore, you deliberately attempt to shuffle the loss upon your fellow-citizen. You are only second in crime to him that put it first into circulation, knowing it to be a fraud.

And here I take occasion to remark that the morality of many professors, if we may judge from what they say, as well as from what they do, in their commercial transactions, is gross immorality and unrighteousness, differing only a slight shade from the grossest robbery and injustice.

To illustrate what I mean, I must allude to a conversation which I heard between a father and his son, both members of the same church, in the presence too of both their families. "My son," said he, "you got cheated in that horse: he stumbles wretchedly, and will certainly go blind. You ought to sell him the first opportunity." "Yes, father, I was deceived; but he is a good-looking horse, and I think by putting him into the hand of our auctioneer I can sell him for cost." "You ought, then, to do it soon," replied his father, or perhaps you will lose by the transaction." "I will send him to town to-morrow, and let the bidder do as I did—trust to his own eyes and judgment; for I will not warrant him." "You ought not to warrant him, for two reasons—First, because the thing is wrong in itself; and in the next place, you might be made to pay the damages. 'Honesty is the best policy,' my son. Remember that."

So fluently and conscientiously, shall I say, do many pass upon themselves the cheat, and act the villain under the guise of honesty and fair dealing. Now had the father said in the presence of all his children, 'My son, when you offer that animal for sale, either in person or by proxy, be sure to have it stated distinctly, that he is a dangerous horse to ride, and will probably go blind; otherwise you may jeopardize the life or safety of the purchaser, besides defrauding him of his dues. What a different sort of training and education of their children, and what a useful lesson might it have proved to them! But in that case, who would have bought the horse? Aye, that was well understood both by father and son. And on that view of the difficulty they plotted a fraudulent sale; flattering themselves that the transaction being done by a third and ignorant person, would excuse them of any injustice or loss in the affair. That, indeed, is almost too favorable a view of their foul deed; for although keeping back his knowledge from the auctioneer might excuse him, it only enhanced his own guilt by making recourse upon himself impossible. It was, indeed, an ingenious device to elude detection and punishment; but in the ratio of its cleverness was its guilt. What a person does by another of this sort is generally more criminal than what he does in person: for while he seeks thereby to conceal himself securely, he hazards the corrupting of his agent.

How often do we hear one say when he finds himself circumvented or entangled in some bad bargain, "I must sell it;" that is, in honest language, 'I must cheat some person, or I will lose by the transaction.' Seldom, indeed, does he sin less in the manner of getting rid of the loss, real or apprehended, than in the actual fraud itself. He always falsifies either by misrepresenting or suppressing fact, and that for the purpose of building up his interests or fortune on the ruins of that of his neighbor. To keep back knowledge and to misrepresent that we may defraud others, are only two modes of committing fraud; and it requires but little knowledge in casuistry to show that in point of actual criminality there is no essential difference.

From these familiar and unpolished specimens of the spirit of the trading and commercial transactions of the world, one may find an easy solution of the apostolic aphorism, that "the love of money is the root of all (moral) evil." We do not impute to any class of the community the exclusive possession or display of this spirit. It pervades the honest farmers and planters, the decent mechanicians and the honorable merchants; with, of course, a few rare and singular exceptions. It is the selfish spirit of the world, exhibiting itself in some of its boldest features. Nothing can dispossess this demon but a faith that overcomes the world—the true Christian faith.

Professors of religion, reared and hackneyed in the ways of the world in the earlier part of life, having had the better feelings of their nature blunted and indurated, are not always capable of appreciating the difference between the spirit of the morality of the world and that of Jesus Christ. Hence we attribute much of the immorality of professors to the defects of their early education and to the force of the evil customs and habits of society. The very atmosphere of the trading world is contaminating. There is no unholier spirit than the spirit of speculation and commercial rivalry. Many of its maxims, such as, "There is no friendship in trade"—"A man must sell what he buys"—"The truth is not always to be told," &c. &c. are not reconcileable to the benevolent spirit and precepts of the gospel.

In more respects than one may riches be called "the mammon of unrighteousness;" for if men told "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," and did to all men what they would have all men do to them, the making of a fortune would not be the work of a few years, nor the result of a few bold and reckless speculations; but then men would be much happier, because under the dominion of the righteous spirit of the gospel, and they would more fully demonstrate the very popular maxim, "An honest man is the noblest work of God." A. C.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

Baptism is every year rising in the esteem of all inquisitive professors in all Protestant parties. The following sketches of the history of the exchange of baptism for rantism; or, to speak in English, of immersion for sprinkling, very generally accords with our readings and researches on the subject. I have frequently desired an opportunity to present in a small volume the whole history of the rite of sprinkling, from its origin to the present day We have not a good history of baptism on earth, and no history at all, good or bad, known to me, of sprinkling or infant rantism. I have many of the materials for such a history; but when I may have leisure to digest and arrange them, I cannot imagine. It would be a curious and interesting history. Meanwhile, the following sketch is worthy of the consideration of those who have not informed themselves of the origin and progress of this modern innovation A. C.

From the Cross and Baptist Journal.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

The Rev. J. F. Bliss, formerly a Congregational minister in Western New York, has written several communications on the subject of Christian Baptism for the New York Baptist Register. Having carefully examined the history of the exchange of immersion for sprinkling, he gives in his fourth number the following "plain facts in the case."

With the Papists the exchange, it is certain, never *began* till after the year 1311. The exchange with them was also very slow, and but very few adopted it for more than two hundred years. For at the time of the Reformation it is certain they generally immersed. It is true a small council of Papists at Ravenna, in 1311, were inquired of whether sprinkling or pouring would do; and that small council seemed to think it would answer the purposes of Papacy well enough, especially in extraordinary cases. It is certain that the Church of England, first formed and organized out of Popery, as their own authors abundantly assert, and in 1534 adopted immersion in their first organization. This fact is confirmed by all history, and by all their rituals, by the parliamentary act of 1534, *enforcing immersion*, and by their great reluctance, during one hundred years' struggle, to take the substitute. It is equally certain that the Congregational and Presbyterian organization, which first came into existence about the same time, also then adopted immersion. This fact is confirmed by the concentrated testimony of all history, by their translations of the New Testament, in which *immerse* and *immersion* were used, (not the Greek words *baptize* and *baptism*,) by their writings during those times, and by the fact that even as late as 1643 their Westminster Assembly were exceedingly reluctant to adopt the substitute; and the vote was ultimately carried by the persevering efforts of Dr. Lightfoot, and finally obtained by a majority of only one vote. The honest part of the Episcopal Church, even as far down as 1640, are found to be exceedingly reluctant to give up the divine ordinance, and to adopt the substitute; and to their honor be it remembered, they never did do it till they were *forced* to it by an act of Parliament. As a religious body, they have, in England, altered their rituals from immersion. These things demonstrate that all these denominations originally had a conscience in favor of the divine ordinance, and against the profane exchange.

The fact is, that John Calvin stands at the head of the profane exchange, among Protestants, and is the father of it. He first began it in 1556, at Geneva. The number of baptisms there became so much increased, that he first in that year invented the practice of *drenching* the candidate by pouring a pail-full of water, as being more convenient than immersion; afterwards of pouring a less quantity, and finally of mere sprinkling. Dr. Wall, Vicar of Shoreham, in describing the fact, says, that pouring was the substitute for baptism, which Calvin first adopted, and that his sprinkling was only the *substitute of a substitute*, and was the most scandalous thing ever adopted for baptism. The sprinkling of our country, then, the Episcopal Wall being witness, is only the "scandalous *substitute of a substitute*"—quite another thing than the divine ordinance itself. During the persecutions under Queen Mary and the bloody Bishop Bonner, many persons from England and Scotland had fled to the continent, and visited Geneva. On the death of Queen Mary, in 1558, and the accession of Elizabeth, they in 1559 returned, and in Scotland and England reported how "the famous godly man, John Calvin, (as he was called,) had improved on baptism; and this substitute was not half so troublesome." From this a small beginning of the use of the substitute commenced in Scotland and in England. The proud persecuting Bishops, seeing its convenience, immediately set themselves at work to *establish* it as a good

enough baptism for their purposes; and it was so much more convenient! They commenced and continued an excitement in its favor, with which the worldly and unprincipled part of the Episcopalians fell in; but the honest part opposed. The Bishops preached before the Parliament, attempting to incite them to pass a law enforcing it; and used language like this, that "the devil of immersion ought to be *legislated* out of the realm, it was so troublesome." Under this state of feeling and excitement, our present translation of the Bible, in just so far as baptism is concerned, was made by these Bishops in 1568, called the "Bishop's Bible." All the perversions we find in it, on baptism, were made by them as the result of that state of feeling. For when King James, in 1607, authorized a new translation, (completed in 1611,) James ordered the translators to leave *baptism* just as it had been rendered by the Bishops. When we read it on baptism, therefore, let us remember who were the translators on that subject, and the spirit and purpose they had in view, and then cease to wonder at the perversions. Let us remember that we can never preach, and send the gospel to every creature, without a *literal* translation of God's word; and that we sin if we indirectly cover over the mind of the Holy Spirit on any subject, by *neglecting* to have it literally translated, and sent every where. It is these Bishops, and the sprinklers, who have the new Bible. *We* plead for the old-fashioned Bible, that has an honest and literal translation, such as had always translated the Greek word *baptizo* and *baptisma*, and not left them in Greek, to blind the people, and had no perversions on the subject, and such as the Bishops gathered up and destroyed, at the time of their translation, in 1568.

To return: The Bishops persisted in their efforts to exchange away the divine ordinance of baptism, while Wall and others wrote in defence of the divine ordinance of immersion, as having always been the ordinance from the days of John the Baptist till then. Still the Bishop's party gained ground—so large a portion of the national church being void of Christian principle.

It was not till the year 1640, that a parliamentary act was finally passed, requiring all the children born in the realm, and all the people, to be sprinkled, under the penalty of being treated as outlaws, and of being deprived of the right of inheritance of estate, the right of burial; and in short, of all the rights secured to the other sprinkled citizens of the realm. From 1534, the beginning of the Episcopal organization, the *immersion* of all babes in the kingdom, and all the people, had been enforced by law, under the same penalty. After 1640, immersion was prohibited, and for many years made *penal* Thus might makes right, and makes right to become wrong, at pleasure; alters the laws of God, and lords it over God's heritage, and over the consciences of men, and changes or annihilates divine ordinances.

The principles of republicanism were not in those days understood by any. Lording it by some, and subjection by the rest, was the only government known. Accordingly Calvin, who evidently loved to lord it, invented and continued the Presbyterian form of church government, empowering the few to govern the many, and acceding to the aristocracies he established above the church, legislative, judicial, and executive powers; the very powers that in fact belong solely to Jesus Christ. This aristocratic Presbyterian body soon passed a law at

Geneva (about 1560) enforcing sprinkling as baptism. This usurpation of power is a fair specimen of Presbyterianism. Calvin alludes to this when he says, "The church (i. e. Presbyterianism,) hath granted to herself the privilege of somewhat altering the form of baptism, retaining the substance;" i. e. the words. What a jewel this, and similar Presbyterianism is!!

John Calvin, then, is the father of this exchange of a divine ordinance, as well as the father of Presbyterianism. *His* Presbyterian aristocracy, acting under the constitution he had formed, and powers he had given them, passed the first law of all enforcing this profane exchange, and enforcing the sprinkling of babes. (See Wall's history.) It was about the year 1560. Here is the first beginning of baby-sprinkling, and the ceremony is the child of John Calvin. Baby-immersion into Popery had been enforced during all the dark ages, and as long as Popery had existed; and a little of it had been practised, in some rare cases, from the year 255 along down to the days of Popery, under different pretensions. It was, however, more than two hundred years too late to be of divine origin. It originated in the time of the pious frauds, baby-communion at the Lord's table, and a hundred other delusions. The case, then, stands thus: The exchange of the divine ordinance of baptism for a mere human device, was invented by John Calvin in 1556, was enforced at Geneva by Presbyterian law, about 1560, was first begun in Scotland and England in 1559, was embraced and determinately contended for by the proud persecuting Bishops, (they perverting the translation of the Bible on baptism, in 1568, in order to favor it,) was finally enforced by parliamentary law about 1640, and was passed into a law for the Presbyterian community, by the Westminster Assembly, in 1643, by a majority of *one*—twenty-four voting against, and twenty-five for it. The Puritans were then accustomed to receive the decisions of a Presbyterian council, or association, as *law*, and the end of all strife. Accordingly sprinkling became their divine law from that time forward, as much as the Book of Mormon became the law of the Mormons in 1830, and as much as Masonic rules became the law of Free Masons after the institution of Free Masonry was contrived by Elias Ashmole, in June, 1717. The delusion of sprinkling, and of infant sprinkling, falsely called baptism, have been propagated on precisely the same principle as these and other delusions—to wit, by assuming the popish principle that the traditions of mother-church, and the laws of her rulers, are of equal force as "proofs of holy writ," and by wresting holy writ to favor them. This is the secret of the whole delusion.

SPECIMENS OF SOPHISTRY—*No. II.*

"ETERNAL life is conditional: therefore all men shall be annihilated that are not within these conditions." This is a palpable *non sequitur;* unless *annihilation* and *eternal life* are perfect contrasts, and the absence of the one necessarily implies the presence of the other—as the absence

of light always implies the presence of darkness, or the presence of darkness implies the absence of light.

Now the question is, Are eternal life and absolute destruction perfect contrasts? or does the presence of the one imply the absence of the other? If not, then are they all deceived by false reasonings who imagine that as the unrighteous cannot possibly enjoy eternal life, they must forever cease to be. Life and death are indeed contrasts, and the presence of the one implies the absence of the other; but life and being are not contrasts: consequently, that which is affirmed of the one is not denied of the other.

Were life and being identical things, then that which is affirmed or denied of the one, would be affirmed or denied of the other; or were they contrasts, then what would be affirmed of the one would be denied of the other; but as all things are not necessarily identical, nor in direct opposition to one another, then all affirmations and negations concerning things, made and affirmed on the ground of identity or opposition, where neither identity nor opposition exists, are obviously fallacious and deceitful.

Facts support these conclusions. They are, indeed, the laws of language founded on facts. The devil has being and demons have being; they are alive, not dead. Have they then temporal, spiritual, or eternal life? *They are not subjects of time; consequently cannot have temporal life.* They are not alive to God; consequently have not spiritual life. They enjoy not God nor the universe; therefore have not eternal life. Still they exist. Being, therefore, is not identical with life, temporal, spiritual, or eternal.

I have read a whole treatise founded upon the delusion that eternal life and eternal being are identical expressions—that whatever is affirmed or denied of the one is affirmed or denied of the other. Let this be conceded, and then it will follow that all who fall short of eternal happiness cease to exist.

Persons at the same moment may be alive in one sense and dead in another. So Jesus taught when he said, "Let the *dead* bury their dead; but [you that are alive] come follow me"—"She," says Paul, "that *lives* in pleasure is *dead* while she lives"—"You has he quickened who were *dead* in trespasses and sins." Is it not, then, a sophism of the first magnitude to affirm that because eternal life is conditional, therefore all who possess not the conditions of that life shall be absolutely destroyed or cease to be forever!

This species of sophism properly belongs to our first rule: *When we assail any dogma we must use the terms of that dogma in the sense of the author of it,*" and not in a sense of our own or of any other person. If

any one affirms "*eternal life*" to be conditional, in opposing that dogma we must use the words "*eternal life*" in his acceptation of them. But does he deny eternal being to the wicked? Then in opposing his proposition we must not prove that eternal life belongs only to the righteous; for that assumes the very point in debate—viz. that eternal life and eternal being, or life and being, are identical or synonymous expressions. In such cases we have only to prove the mistake of the meaning of the terms, and the proposition is refuted. In this particular example we need only show that life and being are not identical, and the work is done. And need any one prove that gold, and silver, and iron, and diamonds, and money have no life, and then demonstrate that they have being! So unnecessary. judge we it to be, to prove that the devil and his angels, and all wicked men, in time or out of it, have being—while they have not *well-being*, the idea always attached to immortality and eternal life in the scriptures.

Rule 2. *The words in every proposition, unless specially defined, are to be taken in the common acceptation.* Of this acceptation dictionaries and classic authors are to be the evidence. Now in ascertaining the sense of any proposition we must have recourse to standards. For example: S— affirms that *everlasting punishment means everlasting annihilation*, or absolute destruction. Do the dictionaries or classic authors ever so define *punishment?* is, then, the proper question.—'They never do,' is the answer; and so the controversy ends.

Reasons, indeed, may be superadded to these authorities why certain words must be so and so interpreted. As in the present case—nothing can be punished that cannot suffer, and nothing can suffer that does not exist. Therefore, punishment without suffering and without existence, is an absurdity. If, then, there be eternal punishment, there must be, on the part of the punished, an everlasting existence; which everlasting existence is never in the gospel nor sacred writings called eternal life.

A. C.

DIFFICULTIES IN CHURCHES—*No. III.*

As a sovereign preventive of difficulties in churches we have shown that an able, discreet, and righteous senate or eldership is one of Heaven's own ordination—an indispensable prerequisite to the good order, peace, health, and prosperity of a community. This senate must be devoted in heart, and set apart to this business under the solemn vows of fidelity to the King and his kingdom, and with a proper feeling of responsibility to the Lord at his coming; else it will

degenerate into an *annual thing*—a *pro tempore* and preparatory measure—a sinecure—a nothing.

But even when this senate is in full and harmonious discharge of its duties to the Lord and his people, it must be submitted to in all its righteous decisions on the part of the community that appointed it, else it will prove utterly useless and unavailing in the grand object of its selection and ordination. The election to rule is, on the part of the electors, an engagement to submit to the elected. On any other hypothesis an election or ordination is a farce. No discreet and devoted servant of Christ would accept of an office in the discharge of which he would not be sustained by the brethren. All that promote to any office a brother, are obliged by every principle of piety and congruity to submit to the administration of that person so long as he exhibits himself faithful to the Lord and the brethren.

It was in this view of the subject that Paul commanded the Jewish brethren to *obey* and *submit* themselves to those who presided over them. His language to the Thessalonians is remarkable: "Consider those who labor among you, and are *over you in the Lord*, and who admonish you." "OVER YOU, UNDER THE LORD." The Lord, then, has placed over them rulers or elders to whom they were to submit, and whom they were "highly to esteem in love for their work's sake."

Now this submission, obedience, and esteem on the part of the brotherhood, had respect to matters of discipline in the administration of the laws of the kingdom much more than simply to their teaching. It was not to them as commentators on the text that submission or obedience was due; but as rulers in the discipline and adjustment of all difficulties that might occur in the family of God.

This is a very decisive proof that discipline was not administered by the whole community in their public assemblies, but by the elders of the church in virtue of their office. There never was a community that got along peaceably and profitably for any length of time that presumed to settle all matters of discipline by a public vote in a public assembly. Such societies as have advocated this wild democracy have either broken themselves to pieces, or greatly dishonored and injured the profession. No family, church, or state could be long kept in order, in harmony, and love under such an economy.

Now if it be no disparagement to our rank as citizens of the state, that we submit to the officers whom we ourselves have created; can it be any diminution of our Christian dignity to obey our own ecclesiastic rulers, who, under the Lord, are over us for our good?

To prevent difficulties in churches these two things are, in my judgment, first in importance—viz. an efficient presbytery in every

congregation, and a rational and scriptural submission to them in the capacity of rulers on the part of the whole brotherhood. The difficulty in obtaining a competent presbytery is not greater than the difficulty in obtaining that spirit of subordination, without which confusion, tumult, and schism will inevitably ensue. This difficulty beset the apostolic churches even under the imperial government of Rome and the despotic and military tyrannies of her provinces. How much more may we expect to encounter it under the popular notions of republican equality and right, which generally distinguish the English people in Europe and in America. If the Apostles had to speak of some who "despised dominion and reviled dignities"—who, "like the angels that kept not their proper place in heaven," were insubordinate, in those days, may we not much more expect it now! If some then perished in the "*gainsaying* and rebellion of Korah," in the same refractory spirit that instigated that memorable rebellion in the days of Moses, may we not expect similar indications in this licentious age! If the Apostles found it necessary to teach their own converts "to *submit*" to those who "ministered to the saints"—to submit to such ministers as the "family of Stephanas," and "to every one that wrought and labored with them," the Apostles—how much more expedient and necessary now under the fierce ecclesiastic democracy that is daily growing up in this community?

Of all the endless and tiresome talkers under the broad heavens, save me from that class who are opposed to all preaching and teaching; whose every sermon is to preach down all preaching, and to teach down all teaching. And of all the tyrants, political or ecclesiastical, that have stained the historic page with their foul deeds of tyranny, anarchy, and misrule, save me from those fierce democrats whose shout in the day and whose song in the night, is—

> All men are born equal and free
> In this blest land of liberty?

I have had the misfortune to be acquainted with some few good brethren of this peculiar idiosyncrasy, whose prosing speeches about nothing would have tired the patience of the angel of Job; and whose generous democracy in a favorable soil would have flourished into a respectable tyranny. They have generally been distinguished, too, for a most infelicitous obtusity of feeling, and a singular shallowness of mind, which pre-eminently forbade their assuming the place they desired to fill; their only, or chief qualification being a laudable desire of usefulness, stimulated by an exhorbitant self-esteem. When I have seen such spirits rise in a worshipping assembly to "occupy only a few moments" with "a very few practical remarks," a chilliness has

suddenly benumbed my soul, which, had they only imagined, might have instantly frozen the genial current of their eloquence, had it but a single element in its composition susceptible of any influence from without. But such perfect masters of themselves are these orators, that not all the coughs of the English House of Commons, nor the broader and more guttural hints of an American Congress, superadded to the sudden decampment of half the congregation, and the screaking of the rusty hinges of the church-yard gate, could cause one thrill of sympathy to derange the onward march of their bright conceptions and ready utterance.

Much difficulty is to be apprehended in every congregation that at all licences in any way such "unruly and vain talkers." They will be thorns in the hands and smoke in the eyes of every congregation that allows them either to dictate or to rule. "Their mouths must be stopped," as Paul said of some voluntary talkers who "sought to draw away disciples after them"—who "crept into houses," and "led captive weak and credulous women, laden with sins and led away with divers lusts." Such persons "resist the truth" and "subvert whole families." It will always require persons of "quick understanding" to detect such characters, and of prompt and decisive character to restrain and govern them. In the parable of the drag-net we are taught to expect in Christ's church, during the present dispensation, a species of almost all the fish in the sea—of almost all sorts of men on earth; and to manage and preside over such a community is a good and arduous work. "If any one desires the office of a bishop," he does not desire a bed of ease—a sofa of indolence—a sinecure; but "a good work." A. C.

NEW INSTITUTION—*No. IV.*

The preparatory arrangements for the establishment of a new Literary and Moral Institution, adapted to the entire wants of human nature and to the improved state of human knowledge, being now made as exhibited in the charter published in our last number, we are now about to call upon our brethren and the friends of education generally, for the means indispensable to the erection and completion of this undertaking. The scheme, so far as developed, has, as far as known to us, met with universal and unqualified approbation. A system of education founded upon all the demands of our nature in the ratio of their importance, developing a human being to himself, his physical, intellectual, and moral constitution—his position in the

universe, and corresponding obligations and duties—his capacities and sources of enjoyment, inducting him into those sciences and moral habits essential to his usefulness and true excellence; is comparatively as novel as it is grand and interesting in the esteem of all genuine philanthropists.

We have not time to expatiate at length upon its merits, nor do we think it necessary. It is confessed by all that such an institution, located as before described, is necessary both for the State and for the Church—for the temporal and eternal interests of mankind; and that if faithfully carried out, must advance the interests of the whole community incomparably beyond all that its establishment can cost that community.

But buildings upon a large scale are necessary even to a commencement. Places are already engaged before we have dug the first spadeful of earth. We wish to lose no time unnecessarily in commencing, and propose the present year to make the preparation for erecting the College Proper, the Stewart's Inn, and the great Family Mansion. We are then obliged to make our *first appeal* to the wealthy and philanthropic portion of the community, that those among them who may be desirous to promote the good of their contemporaries and posterity for generations to come, may have an opportunity of consecrating a portion of that abundance which God, the source of all wealth and prosperity, may have entrusted to their stewardship.

To such persons, conscious of all their responsibilities, I offer no other argument at present than that which our Saviour put into the mouth of those whom he sent to borrow a colt for his own use. He said, "Tell the owner" (for he was an honorable man) "that the MASTER HAS NEED OF HIM." If such persons, possessed of the same spirit, are of opinion that the Master has NEED of their liberality to educate persons, children, or young men for his service, for the promotion of the cause of humanity, the best interests of mankind, I know they will find in their own reflections an eloquent pleader that will say all that they ought to hear to stir up their benevolence.

The only question that will require a moment's discussion, is, Has the Master *need* of such an institution? That he has need of means for certain purposes is admitted by all Christians. To facilitate the decision of this question we only ask, Does mankind, does the church, does the state need such an institution? If not, he does not need it; but if they do, he does need it; for he needs from man whatever is necessary to promote the intellectual and moral improvement of the race. He has, indeed, first given us the power of *lending* to himself! Hence it is written, "He that giveth to the poor *lendeth* to the Lord,

and that which he has given to him will he repay him again." There is no incongruity, then, in saying that the Lord *needs* whatever he has given to us, to promote the happiness of society.

That the community needs such an institution is confessed by as many as can erect it; and we only now appeal to this class, and to such of this class to whom the Lord has bountifully contributed temporal things. We first ask the rich and oppulent, or those who feel that they can aid this enterprize without any serious injury to themselves or their posterity, of their abundance to donate the institution with their free-will offerings, informing us how much they will contribute within the current year, on or before the 1st of January, 1841.

When those whom we now address shall have led the way, if any thing remains to be done by those of less means, but of as liberal minds, we shall call upon them. But as some of this class might justly demur in not being allowed to participate in forwarding an institution in which they may feel quite as much interested, we would inform them that contributions from them will be as thankfully received and as usefully appropriated as the offerings of those of more enlarged means of doing good. We have only room to add, that before any other means be adopted to raise funds, we solicit donations. If these are as generous as we think we have reason to expect, it will make the institution accessible to many worthy persons who may be excluded, if we are compelled to have recourse to other methods of establishing it; besides it will be the work of years to accomplish what could be done in a few months, if those who are able will be prompt and generous as the magnitude of the object would seem to demand. A. C.

DR. PETERS AND THE BIBLICAL REPOSITORY.

The reasons for, or against, any proposition or action are not to be wholly appreciated by the author of them, because of the clearness and force with which they strike his own mind, or that of any one who concurs with him; but also by the effect which they produce on the understanding of those who are of a contrary theory and practice. The weakness of an opponent is not, however, to be taken as evidence of the weakness of his cause, or of the strength of that which he impugns: for then, indeed, Christianity would have suffered in the hands of many a tyro opposed by a Gibbon or a Hume. But when equal erudition and talent are found on both sides of any question, then, indeed, we cannot but feel stronger in our own conclusions when we

perceive the power with which they fall on the understanding of an athletic and skilful opponent.

Few men even in the heat of controversy, and with all their adroitness and powers of dissimulation in full requisition, can altogether conceal the real judgment which they form of the forces with which they have to conflict in sustaining their position before the community. And when we see truth in weak hands successfully battling error in the hands of men of gigantic strength, we cannot but embrace or retain it with a deeper conviction of its excellence and power. In the long protracted controversy which it has been our lot to sustain against all sorts of men and all sorts of errors opposed to the simplicity and excellence of the Christian institution in its apostolic character, we have often been strengthened and animated in discovering how the sturdiest and most learned of our opponents quailed under the force of the evidence presented by those whom they regarded as their inferiors in years, in talents, and in all attainments. Seldom, however, in any controversy in which I have been engaged with persons of distinguished attainments, have I been more emboldened and animated in the discharge of my duties as an advocate for primitive Christianity, than on perusing the last number of the American Biblical Repository, and in contemplating the manœuvring of its truly learned and talented author in giving place to a few pages from my pen, in defence of my sentiments and character from the Vandal assaults of such militant Presbyterians as the Reverend R. W. Landis, of Jeffersonville, Pa.

The Presbyterian denomination have long enjoyed the reputation of possessing a learned and talented ministry. They have many schools and colleges and learned men in their service; and when we see one of their ablest Doctors, selected by the denomination to edit the American Biblical Repository, a periodical which claims one of the highest places in the synagogue of American and European literature and theology, compelled to descend from his high station to act the partizan lawyer in defence of one of his own subalterns who had recklessly, and in an ebullition of conceit, jeopardized the literary and moral standing of the periodical and the party by a malignant or fanatical attack upon our sentiments and reputation; and when we see the talents and erudition of their venerable Rabbi calling to his aid the subterfuges, comments, and manœuvres of the humblest pettifogger, we are more than ever confident of the excellency and evidence of the great principles which we advocate, and of our ability to sustain them against the most arrogant and boastful of our opposers.

The history of this affair is singularly discreditable to the whole denomination of the patrons of the American Biblical Repository. It is as follows;—

In the January and April numbers of said work, for 1839, appeared two articles from the pen of Mr. Landis, endorsed by Dr. Peters, purporting to be a "Review of Campbellism," containing many gross misrepresentations of our sentiments, and sundry palpable and mischievous falsehoods of a highly defamatory and *actionable* character. This Review filled some 70 or 80 octavo pages of the American Biblical Repository. I reviewed it in an Extra at some length. I sent two or three copies of the Extra to Dr. Peters and Mr. Landis, and wrote twice to the former without receiving any answer. Determined no longer to patronize a work of such moral and religious character, I paid up my last year's subscription and ordered a discontinuance. In that letter I addressed the publisher, and gave my reasons for discontinuance, and intimated my intentions to prosecute the affair so far as my moral character was assaulted.

This elicited a long letter from Dr. Peters, upon the whole apologetic for the course he had taken in the affair, and offering "a few pages" in the April number of said Repository "to refute any of the statements I regarded as *untrue* or personally injurious, in a *brief* article."

On these premises I renewed my subscription, and promised such a "brief article," only demanding *half as many pages* in my defence as he had filled in misrepresenting and slandering me.

I accordingly prepared a new review, my former one being too caustic for the nerves of the readers of the Repository. I sent it on in time; and now lies before me the April number of said work, and what think you, courteous reader, has been the fortune of my review? It has suffered in the good old way of the martyrs. It has lost its head, its body has been cruelly mangled, and its extremities cut off. This proof of the discretion and magnanimity of Dr. Peters must greatly endear him in the affections, and exalt him in the admiration of the true partizan. But all honorable men will disdain it. And is it so that I could not be permitted to fill *thirty* pages in my defence against more than twice that number of calumnies and misrepresentations! But still worse, Mr. Landis is sustained in his attack by the *addenda* of Dr. Peters; and now I am not only mutilated and decapitated, but Mr. Landis is defended by marginal notes as far as the Doctor could, with any show of decency or self-respect, be the shield and the bulwark of such a Gothic assailant!

It is truly an honor as unexpected to me, as it must be humiliating to those who have reposed so much confidence in the Editor of the American Biblical Repository. Is there something so convincing, so persuasive, so captivating in our views that Dr. Peters dared not to let them go to his readers, only when veiled by his notes and com-

men's. The great majority of his readers I presume are clergymen and students of sacred literature. If, then, Dr. Peters concluded that it required a shield of the temper and polish of his own armor to defend his readers from the arrows of truth despatched from the bow of reason, what shall we think of his opinion of them and of us!

We can estimate his views of his own strength and of ours, or of his cause and ours, by the odds that he has asked and took in this little rencountre. He has taken more than two pages for my one; he has withholden my introduction, ironical though it was; he has suppressed many of my documentary proofs; he has cut off the peroration of my review; and finally he has lined his margin with notes offensive and defensive. These are the five points of advantage which the Doctor thought essential to the safety of his readers in granting me a hearing on his pages. Well, he is doubtless judicious and prudent in this matter, and has the best right to know how far his readers may be permitted to read any thing we write on the subject; and I am even thankful for the favors I have received from the Doctor: for even with this fearful odds against me, I have been honored and favored far beyond my most sanguine expectations. I shall feel myself indebted to the extraordinary liberality of the Rev. Dr. Peters for many days to come for his unprecedented liberality to me on this occasion, and I must regard it as a very striking indication of the rapid advances of that party in the ways of candor, and as a happy presage of the coming age, and a signal proof of the march of mind in the 19th century.

I will give a few specimens of the parts left out of my defence. The following paragraphs are from the introduction:—

"*Dear Sir*—The honor of heresy, like that of martyrdom, is to be appreciated by the cause which obtains it, and the quarter from which it comes. In latter days it has been too common and too cheap greatly to advance the reputation of any man. Like other American titles, ecclesiastic, civil, and military—such as, Colonel, 'Squire, and Deacon, that of *heretic* is not always a symbol of worth, a passport to favor or respect. That extraordinary virtue which secured this title to a Paul, a Wickliffe, a Tyndal, a Luther, a Calvin, has almost ceased from amongst men. So conscious of this are we Protestants that we seldom confer this honorary degree, in its original and venerable significance, on any, the most ardent and devoted admirers and followers of those celebrated names.

"That fashionable designation *heretic*, so gratuitously and complimentarily handed from one Protestant to another, is no very great honor to any person. I cannot, therefore, very much flatter myself on receiving either the title or the courtesies due to those who, with all their excellencies upon them, anciently attained this truly elevated and enviable rank. Mr. Landis, indeed, has been generous to a fault in his elaborate essay on 'Campbellism,' in his benevolent efforts to honor me above all my compeers of the present day. He has been

at unusual pains to elevate my reputation for various heterodoxies in the esteem of the readers of the 'American Biblical Repository.' I am sorry that it has not been in my power, at an earlier day, to convince him, and that public before whom he has thus honored me, how unworthy I am of all the praises he has so lavishly bestowed. You, my dear sir, know why these compliments have been full fifteen months upon your pages, without any opportunity on my part to thank the author of them—not so much for his justice, as for his generosity, in dealing them out with such unprecedented liberality. At this late date, with all these honors so profusely thick upon me, I am almost ashamed to appear among the prophets to correct some extraordinary errors into which my eloquent panegyrist has fallen in the excessive ardor of his affection for my person, and unbounded zeal to elevate my standing among the heretics of modern times. * * * * * *

"But now at length sympathy, or justice, or some other benevolent principle has triumphed in the bosom of the presiding genius of the prophets, and you, sir, the worthy Editor of the 'Repository,' have vouchsafed me a few pages on which to show reason why I am not entitled to so many saint-like honors as my quondam antagonist, but now *impartial* reviewer, the Rev. Mr. Landis, has, in his excessive zeal, too graciously awarded me."

His first note intimates as much as if he expected me to attend to the rude personalities of Dr. Landis, whereas he gave my friend in New York to know that the personalities in my first review forbade its insertion in the Repository!!

He excludes most, if not all, of my documentary evidence in proof that I have not laid more stress on baptism than the Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Baptists, and many others have done in their creeds—the main difference being that they *preach* and do not *practise*, while we *practise* what we *preach* on this subject. My extracts from Calvin, the Common Prayer, and ten Confessions of Faith are suppressed, my friend the Editor alleging that they were not in his judgment "*pertinent*." Few men think those portions of an argument pertinent that deeply affect their views and principles. "We cannot see," says the Doctor, "how their quotation here avails any thing in his defence."—No, indeed, nor will his readers ever *see*, as long as he measures out their readings of our defence! The Pope never could see any relevancy either in the arguments or quotations of Luther; and, therefore, prudently saved all his people from the labor of reading and examining them.

The capital points—"the Unitarianism of the Campbellites," "the Unitarianism of the New Translation," and the foul and baseless assertions of Mr. Landis about my refusal to correct the ecclesiastical standing of Dr. Doddridge till I "had published several large editions," and the other equally false and malicious imputation of "still retaining the original title" while making many alterations, &c. are neither

noted nor commented on by Dr. Peters. Now as he is always palliating, or excusing, or shielding his brother Landis under the slightest pretence of a reason, his silence on these points triumphantly demonstrates that Mr. Landis is prostrate in the dust, Dr. Peters himself being judge, and that his allegations are utterly insupportable. This relieves me from all that greatly affected my moral reputation with the readers of the Repository, and therefore I release the American Biblical Repository from any farther proceedings in this case. I leave Mr. Landis in the hands of his presbytery. I demand once more, in the name of truth, justice, and candor, that those Editors that republished the misrepresentations and calumnies of Mr. Landis, will now republish my review, or that mutilated part of my review which has appeared in the last Repository.

I am sorry that the more favorable opinion which I sought to entertain of Dr. Peters on his proposal to publish an article for me in self-defence, has been already seriously impaired by the one-sided, illiberal and uncourteous manner he has treated this essay. Even when in defence of some typographical errors and omissions in one edition of the New Version, I intimated similar errors in Stuart's version of the single Epistle to the Romans, which has, it seems, hitherto escaped the notice not only of Professor Stuart, but of Mr. Landis, and even of Dr. Peters himself; he has the temerity to intimate a doubt as to the verity of my statement. In doing this he has, unintentionally, perhaps, confessed his ignorance of the fact alluded to. Now, says Dr. Peters, "As Mr. C. does not inform us what verse is here referred to, the reader will of course wait for proof of the correctness of his assertion." p. 500. Well, now, as the Dr. himself confesses ignorance and waits for proof, I will give it him. It is worse than one verse. The omission includes almost a period in verse 9, and an entire period in verse 10, chapter xvi. Salute—"and Stachys my beloved—Salute Apelles, approved in Christ." When will Roman Bishops and Protestant Doctors of Divinity cease to expose themselves by questioning my facts! I may hereafter publish all the suppressed parts of my Review, which my friend Dr. Peters regarded as not necessary nor pertinent to my purpose. A. C.

THE GOSPEL—"A DELUSIVE AND SUBTLE HERESY."

In Mr. James B. Taylor's letter of resignation to the Second Baptist Church of Richmond, the following unjust and unfriendly sentiment is found, concerning the Gospel of Christ:—

"The church has been distinguished for her faithful adherence to the truth. When a *delusive subtle heresy* was gaining upon many of the churches, and even in Richmond, ours, with the exception of five or six, remained firm."

This "delusive subtle heresy," of which Mr. Taylor speaks so complacently, is nothing more nor less than the gospel of Christ, as exhibited in the inspired writings.

We hope that his life may be yet spared, that he may see the error of his ways, repent of his hard sayings and doings against the old gospel, and yet preach the words and institutions of our Lord as he left them.

Incalculable injury is done to the cause of Christ, by such insinuations as are contained in the above extract, especially when made by such a man as James B. Taylor, to whom piety, moderation, and good sense are every where accredited.

Mr. Taylor must be aware that his Baptist friends are most wofully ignorant of our views—that they attribute sentiments and practices to us, which we universally repudiate; and under these circumstances, instead of inflaming their minds, already inordinately excited against us, he should, as a lover of peace, good will, and especially of justice, refrain from insinuations unauthorized by any view of our faith and practice which a candid and unbigoted mind can take.

His opposition to the ancient gospel in former years, under the excitement that then agitated the community with which he is connected, may find some palliation with posterity: but such cool, deliberate, and insidious thrusts at the best and purest of all causes, as are found in his valedictory letter, will only be read in future time to remind the candid that bigotry once ruled with tyrant sway in hearts accredited with the largest share of Christian charity and tender sympathy.

What is there in all that we teach that is "delusive" or "subtle"? Will Mr. Taylor inform our readers? Space shall be allowed him. We teach that the holy scriptures are "able to make us wise unto salvation:" is this "delusive subtle heresy"? We teach that Christ died for our sins, was buried, and raised again on the third day: is there delusion or subtlety in these facts? We teach that without faith, living faith in him, there is no salvation: is this subtle delusion? We exhort all believers to "repent and be baptized for the remission of sins:" (Acts ii. 38.) is there subtlety or delusion here? We teach all Christians to love one another—not to forsake the assembling of themselves together—to attend stedfastly upon the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, breaking the loaf, and prayers—to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, administer to the afflicted, console the disconsolate; and, by patient continuance in well-doing, to seek for glory, honor, and immortality; are these teachings subtle and delusive heresies? May Heaven forgive the temerity that asperses the cause and the disciples of Christ!

The Doctors and Rabbis of an apostate age charged Christ and his followers with "heresy." The Doctors and Reverends of this day charge his disciples still with "heresy." In both instances the charge has been cheaply made. It never has and never will cost the proof. Prejudice and bigotry have always preferred the charges. Let them have the glory of the worthy deed. Let them record it in their inaugurals and valedictories—let them record it in their biographies and

histories: but ift hey reap not a harvest of shame for it in this world, let not the saints suppose that their reproaches pass with impunity under the eye of righteous Heaven; but rather let them remember that there cometh a "day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God." Glory to God in the highest! The Christians crown is unsullied by all the accriminations of infidels or sectaries, and unsulliable by all the insinuations ef unrelenting bigotry.

Mr. Taylor certainly saw through a glass darkly, when he characterized our teachings as "delusive and subtle." We preach facts, commands, threatenings, &c. These are *tangibles*, not *subtleties*. Perhaps his own creed might furnish him with some fairer specimens of genuine *subtleties:* such as *eternal election and predestination, abstract spiritual influence*, &c. &c. These metaphysical and subtle things, together with a thousand kindred ones, we accredit to the account of Calvin, Wesley, Fuller, and their adherents. We have no use for them; but would cordially pray our heavenly Father to deliver mankind in general, and especially our quondam brethren, the Baptists, from such inoperative subtleties.

[The above just and sensible remarks are from the Editors of the Christian Publisher. A. C.

News from the Churches.

Mentor, Ohio, March 18, 1840.

We have 'awaked the lyre of Israel' in Mentor. 'The spirit of the Lord has breathed upon the valley of dry bones,' and they have stood up a living army. On Friday the 14th ult. we commenced a protracted meeting in this place, father Bentley (my father in the gospel) being with us. We began the meeting under the *solemn* conviction that nothing could be done acceptably to the Lord until the *church* was purified. We thought 'the time had come when judgment should begin at the house of God.' We therefore addressed the disciples exclusively on the first two days. We attended briefly, but powerfully, to the history of the church. You know something of it, my dear brother, but you do not know all. You know how we were beset and despoiled by that *demon*—Mormonism. But worse, far worse than all that, since that time two of our most *prominent members* had been excluded for *gross immorality!* O! my dear brother, I have wept and prayed over the condition of this church: yes, when separated from them by distance, during the three years that I spent in your part of the country. Yes, my brother, it was among the last things for which your dear sister, my beloved Alicia, prayed that the church in Mentor might be restored to their lost enjoyments—that they might be brought back from the 'cold streams of Babylon where the harps had been hung upon the willows.' But during all this defection there were a few praying souls in the church; and their preacher, our beloved brother Williams, is a holy man. He has deeply mourned over the desolations of Zion. Well, by Saturday afternoon we had brought the church to *see* and *feel* their condition. They began one by one to make confession of their *sins*—their coldness, their stupidity, their selfishness, and love of the world. One of the brethren rose and read that beautiful and impressive portion of the holy scriptures—the first part of the 35th chapter of Genesis. 'And God said unto Jacob, Arise, go up to Bethel, and dwell there, and make an altar unto God that appeared to thee when thou fledest from the face of Esau thy brother. Then Jacob said unto his household, and to all that were with him, Put away the *strange gods* that are among you, and *be clean*, and change your garments,' &c. After the confessions and exhortations were finished we sung, 'Go on, you pilgrims, while below,' and I went round and shook hands with them all in true Kentucky style. The effect was electrical. Our northern folks, you know, do not know any thing about such enthusiasm! Their hearts were melted into tenderness and love—love to God and one another.

Lord's day morning father Bentley spoke from the 90th Psalm, on sin and its effects, consequences, and cure. It was a most happy effort. It was the eloquence of the *heart!* Indeed, we have had no other at this meeting. At candlelight I spoke from the 9th

Psalm. I showed that the exclamation, 'Who will show us any good?' characterized the great mass of mankind in all ages; that they had sought happiness in externals—in a change of state and circumstances, instead of a change of heart and character. I showed the people, from reason and from scripture, that the seat of happiness was where the kingdom of God is said to be—'within us.' I exhorted the people in the words of the Psalm—'Commune with your own hearts;' quoted to them the words of the Vicar of Wakefield—'O, my children, if you but knew what good company you could make your own hearts, you would little regard the elegance and splendor of the worthless.'

There was a large company of young people present. I attacked their balls and pleasure parties with unrelenting hostility; showed them that they sought those scenes of amusement because they wished to get away from *themselves*—because they did not like to 'commune with their own heart.' I labored to show them that those scenes were scenes of perfect intoxication; that the bliss of those scenes was essentially the same as that of the drunkard; that their gaiety and mirth, their folly and dissipation, only *drowned* the aching of their hearts. I then pointed them to a cheap and infallible method of obtaining good company—viz. to 'purify their souls by obeying the truth;' to make peace with their own consciences by applying 'the blood of sprinkling,' 'the blood of the new covenant,' and assured them that their consciences thus purified, and their hearts thus filled with heavenly love and bliss, would become such good company that they would never again desire the pleasure party or the dissipation of the ball-room.

I then turned a heavy hand upon the system of Universalism; showed that this was the same delusion as the former—the pope of happiness by a change of external circumstances—a change of state or condition; or by getting away from ourselves. I urged strongly that 'the kingdom of God is with us;' that our souls must be made the seat of heavenly love, or heaven will be no heaven to us. The discourse concluded, we sung a hymn and three young persons came forward.

Monday morn met at 9 for prayer, (as indeed we had every morning.) At 10 father Bentley preached, and after some exhortations six more came forward to obey the Saviour. Thus nine were immersed, and the disciples now know the meaning of the apostolic language, 'rejoicing with joy unspeakable and full of glory.'

On Thursday three young ladies came forward. One of them was emphatically 'the belle' of the place. The audience was overwhelmed.

The meetings continued with unabated interest until Lord's day, the 22d, when we received to our communion, by giving the right hand of fellowship, nineteen persons, three of whom had long since apostatized from the church. They came back with hearts broken for sin. They were received with even greater joy than new converts.

On Saturday eve the Universalian preacher of the place rose up after the discourse, and, in a truly Christian manner, expressed his concurrence with the leading truths exhibited by us, and his joy at the change that had taken place.

In the mean time, dear brother, we feel assured from every thing that appears, that the work is but just begun. I cannot therefore think of leaving Mentor for a year to come. I feel that I can do more good here than any where else. The England tour must therefore go by the board for the present. But you shall hear from me soon again. In the mean time tell our beloved father to come and see us instanter; he will find here what he has long been seeking—viz a church enjoying heaven upon earth. The houses of the brethren are all Bethels.

M. S. CLAPP

Cincinnati, Ohio, March 20, 1840.

Last night brought to a close a series of meetings that have been continued, with only two exceptions, since the 16th day of January last. We were favored by the visits of brethren New, Gass, Watkins, Thompson, Ricketts, and Moss. The three latter labored industriously, scattering the good seed of the kingdom with a liberal hand, and gathered in a glorious harvest for their reward. One hundred and eighty-nine became obedient to the gospel!! It is famed of the illustrious Cyrus, that he not only conquered his enemies, but, by the graciousness of his behaviour, enlisted them in his army to help on his conquests! Our brethren had but one weapon—the Sword of the Spirit, the Word of God; and this they wielded so successfully that they made captives of the different armies of Presbyterians, Methodists, Episcopalians, Quakers, Swedenborgians, Universalists, and Roman Catholics!!! and some of these are already active in the King's army. The brethren were much instructed by the labors and teachings of these brethren; and this season of joy and rejoicing will no doubt be long remembered by all the parties. We could not help making a little inroad among our old Baptist friends. Some of them have cut loose from their old moorings, and anchored on the Rock of Ages. Our brother Challen, who you know is resident with us, labored with these brethren, following them with his happy powers of exhortation, increased and sharpened by the occasion. Thirty-seven united with us by letter, &c. thus making an increase at this time of 226.—March 30. Brother Lucas is now with us, and speaks to the people every night, and already several have obeyed. Our congregation numbers now nearly 600 disciples. [Some 15 or 20 have been since added—April 10th.]

E. B. HOWELLS.

Charlestown, March 28, 1840.

I have this day returned from Middletown, Ky. where I commenced proclaiming on the 20th, and continued the meeting eight days, and immersed twenty-three into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

NEWTON SHORT.

Dupont, Jefferson county, Ia. March 25, 1840.

Since I came to this place I have met with our much esteemed and beloved brother Mavity. He has been very useful in this neighborhood. The gospel here is perfectly new. Several persons have already been immersed, and prospects fine. W. V. Utter, a relative of mine, with whose education I have had something to do, was among the first to obey the Lord in this neighborhood. He is a young man of unexceptionable character, and exceedingly dear to me by a long and intimate acquaintance. How my soul rejoices at such accessions to the kingdom of divine favor!

During my eighteen months labor in Clinton and Highland counties I have had the pleasure of seeing many persons turn to the Lord, and had large opportunities of becoming acquainted with human nature. But now, with our excellent brother of Kentucky, "I go a-fishing" O Lord, send more laborers into thy vineyard, who shall not fail nor be discouraged until righteousness be firmly established in the earth!

B. U. WATKINS.

Auburn, New York, February 10, 1840.

The cause of truth is rather looking up in these parts. There have been eight immersions lately into the ancient faith, and the brethren generally are waking up to the importance of more active measures to propagate the truth and convert the aliens from Satan to God through Jesus Christ. The prospects are very favorable in Tully. Two years ago last summer the apostolic gospel began first to be preached in that town. A year ago last May about twelve associated together to worship the Lord according to the King's laws. They have increased to nearly thirty, grown much in knowledge, and love, and zeal for the Lord and his cause, with prospects fair

Last August and September I spent four weeks in Bradford and Clinton counties, Pa., in company with brother S. E. Shepard. Thirty-five obeyed the King, surrendering to his institution for remission of their past sins—14 in Canton, 18 in Salona, and 3 on Beach Creek.

J. M BARTLETT.

Georgetown, Kentucky, March 24, 1840.

I have just reached home from a tour of ten days at Cynthiana, about 20 miles distant. Owing to a variety of causes we were not so successful as usual. We had to encounter, as usual, a partizan opposition. Our Methodist friends granted us the privilege of their house while it was unoccupied by themselves.

I labored hard and gained 15 additions, 8 of whom were by confession and immersion. The congregation was much strengthened in the additions. The prospects were most flattering, and I calculate on returning there in a few days. What gave additional interest to the scene, was the burial in baptism of a worthy patriarch of 73, upwards of six feet high, whose silver locks bid all beware of the approach of death and the dissolution of all things Our beloved brother Irvin was with me a few days at the close of the meeting. His health was very delicate.

We are to have a state meeting in Harrodsburg, as you have published; but the brethren have certainly omitted in the notice what is important to be attended to. We desire that each congregation shall send by messengers or transmit information as to the number of each congregation, when organized, their officers, their location &c. as it was done in Indiana. I should rejoice if you could be there Your remarks on liberality to Evangelists are most excellent If the brethren act *liberally* many more able Evangelists will enter the field Speak out, if you please, on this subject.

J T. JOHNSON.

Greensburg, Decatur county, Indiana, March 12, 1840.

The good cause of our kind Saviour is triumphing gloriously. I have immersed about 36 since the first of January last. I have just returned from Cincinnati, where the brethren are doing well: they have immersed about 200 there since the 16th of January last. At a six days meeting at the town of Harrison we immersed 27, and 6 others added to the church Our beloved brother L. H. Jamieson was with us part of the time, and our much esteemed brother Rude, one of the Bishops of the church there, helped us in the good work. On my return here I have immersed 5, and we expect more soon. We have meeting every night, and part of the time in the day. The brethren here are in better spirits than they have been for five years past, and we hope that much good will soon be done. May the good Lord help all the holy brethren to do all that they can to save sinners and to save the church! Amen!

J. B. NEW.

Greensburg, April 1, 1840.

I came to this place about the last of October, since which time there has been about 20 additions to the church in this place, and the brethren generally much revived and encouraged in the work of the Lord. I have immersed about 50 since the first of January last, and about half that number in this county, while the prospect is good for many more. as the people appear disposed to hear the word with attention. If all the brethren would do all in their power, the truth would prevail over all error, and sinners would come flocking to the Redeemer in crowds. My whole time, talent, and all that I have, is devoted to the cause of truth. May we all be faithful until death, that we may receive the promised inheritance in the everlasting kingdom!

J. B. NEW.

Pendleton, Putnam county, Ohio, March 24, 1840.

The evening being unfavorable to my digging on my farm, I have concluded to spend a few minutes in writing to you, for the purpose of giving you some information in references to the reformation in this new country. When I came here, near four years ago, I found one small congregation of disciples, over whom brother Daily presided as bishop, and whom I have found to be one of the most faithful and indefatigable bishops in this part of the state. By our united efforts, and occasionally some others, and especially the faithful labors of our beloved brother Dowling, who is travelling as an evangelist among us, we amount now to hundreds. We have the united efforts of most of the denominations in this country to contend against. They have formed to themselves a *monster*, and which by common consent they have concluded to call *Campbellism*. And in reference to this monster they have placed us between the horns of a dilemma, and upon one of which we have to fall in their view of things. Should we acknowledge the correctness of their monster, then we are no better than Deists, and the doctrine no better than Deism. But upon our disclaiming all connexion with their monster, and preaching the truth, we are branded with being hypocrites. We have always endeavored to be gentle towards all men, and not to spend our time in contending about untaught questions. The result is the truth as leaven is working in the hearts of hundreds who have not become obedient to the gospel. We anticipate much the coming season; but it is human nature to be sanguine. It may be so with us; still we are thankful to the Father of all mercies for what he has done for us in this new country. W. J. WILSON.

Glasgow, Ulster county, New York, January 7, 1840.

A young brother, formerly a student in the Lutheran Seminary at Hartwick, Oswego county, having been led to renounce every thing not found in *the Book*, when he knew not that there was another soul in these United States standing on the same ground—has, since his believing and obeying the truth, been very successful in proclaiming the glad tidings of salvation and bringing sinners to an acknowledgment of the truth in every place he has visited. But his usefulness is likely to be much injured by some who profess to be guided by the *Word of God alone*, and who are making laws and regulations not found in that *Word*, and require him and others to submit to them. For his, as well as their sakes, I would submit the following queries for your consideration, hoping they will meet with prompt attention; and if brother Campbell has not leisure or opportunity to attend to them, father Campbell or brother Richardson would confer a favor by answering them in the Harbinger at as early a date as possible—

1. When a proclamation of the gospel is made, and persons believe, reform, and wish to be immersed, is it necessary for the proclaimer to ask permission of the church before he immerses them into the name of the Lord?

[It must be only on some peculiar occasion ——A. C.]

2. Are persons thus submitting to the Lord constitutionally members of his church or kingdom, or must they first have the vote of the church, and then be received as members by the right hand of fellowship?

[They are not members of any particular church till formally received —A. C.]

3. Is it scriptural or proper when the disciples meet to break bread, to attend to cases of discipline? or is it more fit to appoint a monthly meeting on some day or evening of the week to attend to these things?

[The worship is not be marred by cases of discipline. See Essay on Church Order — A. C.]

You may say that you have answered all these things in your previous writings; but, my dear brother, the Apostle Peter declared that he would not be negligent continually to put them in remembrance of these things that they might be able after his decease to remember them. I hope they will meet your attention for the sake of our young brother, who, after sacrificing so much for the truth's sake, and now to meet with opposition and reproach from those from whom he expected assistance and encouragement for refusing submission to their rules and laws, is a great trial to one so young, ardent, and zealous in the cause of our blessed Master. W. S.

☞ The following from the Nottingham and London Christian Messenger intimates the dawnings of a better day in Old England and Scotland. The extracts are from the March number We shall, as often as possible, add the foreign news to our monthly records and notices:— A. C.

ITEMS OF NEWS.

Newark, 1840.

It gives me great pleasure to say, the brethren and sisters who have put on the Lord Jesus, are walking in the love of the truth, and desiring a more enlarged and extensive acquaintance therewith. Love and unanimity prevail, which is encouraging. Seven have recently made the good confession, and have been immersed into Jesus for the remission of sins. Our number now is upwards of 40 Brother, labor on; do all you can in ex-

tending a knowledge of the truth: in due time you will reap a glorious reward; Jesus our Lord will soon be here; happy they who shall be found watching! J. B.

On the 23d ultimo three were immersed into Jesus, and added to the brethren in Nottingham. These make eight or ten within the last two months

Scotland, Turiff, December, 1839.

Although not personally acquainted with you, nor with any of your brethren in Nottingham, or in the South of Scotland; yet, holding one Lord, one faith, one baptism, &c., I venture, with the concurrence of my brethren here, to write to you.

On the 19th of April last year, six of us agreed to associate ourselves together, with a desire to attend to all things which Christ has commanded, taking the word of God *alone* as our guide. Our number is now increased to eighteen. We have received very great benefit from the *Christian Messenger*, Essay on Remission of Sins, Church Order, Grew's Tribute to the Memory of the Apostles, &c. These works have been the means of suggesting truths, which, without their help, probably would not have been discovered.

I have also to acquaint you that a few brethren meet alternately in Banff and Petgair, on the Lord's day, for Christian worship, according to the primitive plan. W. M.

The following items are taken from a letter dated Edinburg, February 20, 1840.

"Two weeks ago we baptized two individuals into the name of Jesus, who seem ever since to have been rejoicing in the truth. I am glad to see the cause is making some progress in this country. I had a letter from Dundee to-day, from which I learn that twenty-three have made the good confession, and have been immersed since I last wrote you. These make in all upwards of seventy within the last few months. I have no doubt that the brethren in this country could uphold two evangelists, sowing the seed and planting churches in every place. Can such an arrangement be made?" W. T.

Lincoln, February 18, 1840.

On Lord's day, the 16th, we had a visit from our beloved brother, W. S——. The opportunity was delightful, and very encouraging. After a powerful address from him, in the evening two persons arose, confessed the faith, and next day were immersed into Jesus for the remission of sins through faith in his blood. We now sit down together, fourteen in number, in the Lord. Thus you see, brother, that it is not by might, or human strength, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord, that no flesh may glory in his presence. Our brother should be stationed at Lincoln, as an evangelist. If age, experience, prudence, and self-denial are wanted, he is the man. E. A.

That our brother W. Scott, should be employed as an evangelist, is what we most firmly believe, nor can we do otherwise than rejoice that our heavenly Father should have led him to take the steps he has done. That he should be stationed at Lincoln only, does not appear to us so self-evident. To labor at Goulsby, Dunnington, Louth, Horncastle, Spilsby, Lincoln, &c. alternately, and that the brethren there, in connexion with those at Newark and Nottingham, should sustain him, is what we would most cordially recommend. If such an arrange-

ment could be made, the place of residence must be left with the brother himself. May the Lord give to all his children a plenitude of pure love and benevolence to promote the spread of his unadulterated truth in the world!——*Ed. C. M.*

ESSAY ON REMISSION OF SINS.

The first edition of this unanswered, and, in our judgment, unanswerable Essay, has been disposed of; some hundreds of which have been gratuitously distributed, with very great advantage to the cause of primitive Christianity. This being the case, and still having many inquiries for it, we have determined to print a *second edition.*

Could the edition be at once disposed of, the surplus, after paying for paper and printing, should be immediately appropriated for the support of an Evangelist, either in England, Scotland, or Ireland.—This, it is true, would do but little of itself; but, aided by the contributions of the brethren, much might be done. The mutual co-operation of the followers of the Lord is very desirable.

Our desire is that all who can, will immediately come forward and engage in this twofold manner of benefiting their Christian brethren and fellow-men. All orders should be immediately sent to the Editor.

Ed. C. M.

THE PHILANTHROPIST AND MORALITY OF CHRISTIANS—*No. XVIII.*

My remarks on the duty of masters to "render to their servants what is *just* and *equal*," have fixed upon me "the brand of *proslavery*" in the warm charities of Dr. Bailey of "The Philanthropist." The Doctor is a very zealous and spirited writer, and conducts the abolition press of Ohio. I have always heard a good report of him, and believe him to be a very honest and sincere believer and advocate of the abolition dogmas of the ultra superlative school. But he gets a little snarlish at times; and on reading my 18th Essay on the Morality of Christians an evil spirit seems to have come upon him, which has borne him so far beyond his usual courtesies that he concludes a long comment on my remarks with these philanthropic and benevolent words:—"Mr. Campbell may yet live to curse the day when he took his pen to prove slavery sinless."

I expected, indeed, that my address to Christians, who had the misfortune to be masters at the South, would not be altogether popular with those philanthropists who have forgotten that philanthropy includes the love of both master and servant, and contemplates justice and kindness to all; but really I was not expecting from any friend of human rights such a misconception and misrepresentation of what I have written, nor such a suspicioning of my motives, and consequent

calumniating of my character, while professing not to design it, as now appears in the "Philanthropist" of April 7th. If this be *philanthropy* and a fair specimen of the spirit of human rights, I shall not wonder if the author makes but few proselytes.

Whatever excuse I might charitably frame for Dr. Gamaliel Bailey, Editor of this paper, for converting my ironical reproof of those Southerners who called American slavery a patriarchal institution, while yet they dreaded insurrection of their slaves, (a misconception, by the way, which could I have anticipated on the part of any one of half the sense of the Philanthropist, I should have taken pains in the margin to have prevented;) I say, whatever excuse I could form for such a singular misapplication of my words, I am wholly unable to find any justification or excuse for the attempt to assail and suspicion my motives and disparage my character for the sake of proving that the holding a man in servitude is a sin in every particular case, without any regard to the conditions or the laws under which it is done. Any one can conceive of many cases in which it is a sin; but Dr. Baily can conceive of no case in which it is not a sin. *I can:* and for that very reason he must tell us of Burke's satire upon Charles Townsend, and of all the difficulties of holding and inculcating two sets of opinions on any question!! and thus instead of showing my position either unscriptural or unjust, in much seeming candor he arraigns my motives and depreciates my character, and tells me I "may yet live to *curse the day*," &c. &c.

This is only surpassed by an assurance that if any book,—the Bible itself,—taught any thing "contrary to this primary fact of human consciousness—that man has a right to himself;" in the Doctor's opinion that book "deserves to be *burned*." The reason, then, why the Bible deserves not to be burned is, that it teaches Dr. B's view of human consciousness of this right; otherwise, it should be committed to the flames!

The Liberalists of France thought that the Bible countenanced the pretensions of Kings and Priests, and therefore they concluded that it deserved to be burned, and before committing to the flames ordered it to be dragged through the streets of Paris by the common hangman.—The Doctor is a man of feeling, and I presume means very well; but such ultraisms always savor more of weakness than of strength, and impede rather than advance the progress of any cause. I do not wonder at the increase of a proslavery spirit at the South, on other grounds than that of conviction of its utility or moral fitness. Such assaults as that before me, were my principles unsettled, would have a tendency to drive me into proslavery measures.

He has as much mistaken me as he has the legitimacy, utility, and benevolence of my reasonings in the aforesaid article, when he insinuates so adroitly that I temporize, or seek for fame, or any sinister object on this or any other moral subject. In that article I expressed sentiments known to be mine before the days of abolition began to be, and sentiments which were they properly understood and duly appreciated, I still think would be eminently promotive of general good. I cannot imagine what blessedness either to master or servant, to free states or slave states, could possibly arise from the *immediate* emancipation of all the slaves in these United States in their present habits, economical and moral; but I can conceive of immense advantage, political and moral, to the whole community, if "masters would render to their servants that which is just and equal;" and "if servants would obey in all things their masters according to the flesh"—"not only the good and gentle, but even the froward." Therefore I am neither an apologist for American slavery, nor an advocate of instant and universal emancipation; but I am for doing justice to master and to servant, and for having them to do justice to one another; I am for approaching by an inclined plane a point which, to attempt in any other way would, in my opinion, be a great injury to master and servant, and would increase rather than diminish the grievances and evils, political and moral, so generally complained of. I am, above all, for having Christians (to whom alone I address myself on this subject) who have servants to carry out all the injunctions given to them in the New Testament, and thus to promote the present and the future happiness of those whose eternal destiny is in a great measure entrusted to them: and in case of neglect of duty in any instance, I am for having them called to an account for it by those who watch for their souls as they shall have to answer for it in the great day of accounts. A. C.

MINUTES OF SAVANNAH RIVER BAPTIST ASSOCIATION, SOUTH CAROLINA.

38th Anniversary, Barnwell District.

The old work of misrepresentation and proscription is now going on in those southern regions where the gospel is taking most effect.—From the corresponding letter for 1839, of the Savannah River Baptist Association, we shall give a few extracts illustrative of the manner in which the Baptists are imposed on by the foul spirit of false representation. There is no excuse for these slanders now-a-days. They are

wilful and perverse. Time was in which ignorance might have been supposed; but our views are now fully published in those regions.—We have room for but a few samples:—

"We perceive that one or two of the churches have been, for a short time, annoyed by the doctrines of Mr. Campbell; but we bless God, that, as with individual Christians, so with churches, afflictions tend to purify and elevate. We should never forget, that as there is a gathering time, there will also be a season of winnowing and sifting. 'There must needs be heresies, that they which are approved amongst you may be made manifest.' With regard to this error, we earnestly entreat you to use mildness with firmness. Many real Christians may at first be 'carried away by the cunning craftiness of those who lie in wait to deceive,' and many who are 'God's own children' may be 'children tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine.' We advise you, then, to be gentle, and never to precipitate measures—pray for such—weep over them—and endeavor to restore them in the spirit of meekness. We know there is a point where discipline must begin, and 'them that trouble you be cut off;' but we recommend that this be viewed as a last resort.

"The writings of Mr. Campbell authorize us to say, that he teaches many things contrary to the word of God, and fatal to the salvation of men. He degrades the exercises of the heart, and ascribes to externals an undue importance; he expressly denies that the term 'sanctification' is 'expressive of any quality of mind, or any personal attribute of body, soul, or spirit'—and declares it to signify only 'a state or condition'—by which he means a *relative* change as opposed to an *actual* and *personal* change; he makes this change to be the result of an external bodily act, and this act to be baptism: he declares that regeneration, or the new birth, and baptism, are the same thing. With regard to the operations of the Holy Ghost, his writings are full of studied ambiguity, but yet enough can be detected of his meaning to warrant the assertion that he admits the influence of the Spirit of God in convincing men only as contained or embodied in the Bible, just as the spirit of any author is breathed in his writings, and denies thus the actual personal operations of the Holy Ghost. We might enumerate errors of this kind, but these are enough. The *Millennial Harbinger Extra* contains these pernicious doctrines. Now we cannot believe that any truly converted soul will long adhere to such doctrines. He may for a season be ensnared; but as soon as the charm of novelty has passed, he will see that they are opposed to the truth of God, or feel that they contradict his own experience. We view this heresy, therefore, without any alarm, and class it among those evils out of which God will bring good."

Now compare this with the following passages in the *Christian System*:—

"But though these terms represent state and not character, there is a relation between state and character, or an influence which state has upon character, which makes the state of immense importance in a moral and religious point of view.

"Indeed, the strongest arguments which the Apostles use with the

Christians to urge them forward in the cultivation and display of all the moral and religious excellencies of character, are drawn from the meaning and value of the *state* in which they are placed. Because forgiven, they should forgive; because justified, they should live righteously; because sanctified, they should live holy and unblameably; because reconciled to God, they should cultivate peace with all men, and act benevolently towards all; because adopted, they should walk in the dignity and purity of sons of God; because saved, they should abound in thanksgivings, praises, and rejoicings, living soberly, righteously, and godly, looking forward to the blessed hope." p. 195.

"Being born again is not *conversion*, nor a *change of views*, nor a *change of affections*, but a *change of state*. True, indeed, that of the person who is born again we may suppose a change of views, a change of heart, and we may infer a change of character, and may therefore say he is enlightened, renewed in heart, converted as well as born again; but this license respecting the *person*, the subject of the change, is not allowed in talking of the *change* itself. A Christian is, indeed, one whose views are enlightened, whose heart is renewed, whose relations to God and the moral universe are changed, and whose manner of life is according to righteousness and true holiness.

"But the Spirit is not *promised to any person out of Christ*. It is promised only to them that believe in and obey him. These it actually and powerfully assists in the mighty struggle for eternal life. Some, indeed, ask, 'Do Christians need more aid to gain eternal life, than sinners do to become Christians? Is not the work of conversion a more difficult work than the work of sanctification?' Hence they contend more for the work of the Spirit in conversion, than for the work of the Spirit in sanctification. This, indeed, is a mistaken view of the matter, if we reason either from analogy or from divine testimony. Is it not more easy to plant, than to cultivate the corn, the vine, the olive? Is it not more easy to enlist in the army, than to be a good soldier and fight the battles of the Lord; to start in the race, than reach the goal; to enter the ship, than cross the ocean; to be naturalized, than to become a good citizen; to enter into the matrimonial compact, than be an exemplary husband; to enter life, than to retain and sustain it for three score years and ten? And while the commands, '*believe*,' '*repent*,' and '*be baptized*,' are never accompanied with any intimation of peculiar difficulty; the commands to the use of the means of spiritual health and life; to form the Christian character; to attain to the resurrection of the just; to lay hold on eternal life; to make our calling and election sure; &c. are accompanied with such exhortations, admonitions, cautions, as to make it a difficult and critical affair, requiring all the aids of the Spirit of our God, to all the means of grace and untiring assiduity and perseverance on our part: for it seems 'the called' who enter the stadium are many, while 'the chosen' and approved 'are few;' and many, says Jesus, 'shall seek to enter into the heavenly city, and shall not be able,' 'let us labor, therefore, to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief.'

"Sanctification in one point of view is unquestionably a progressive work. To sanctify is to set apart. This may be done in a moment; and so far as mere *state* or *relation* is concerned, it is as instantaneous as baptism. But there is the formation of a holy character; for there

is a holy *character* as well as a holy *state*. The formation of such a character is the work of means: 'Holy Father,' said Jesus, 'sanctify them [my disciples] through thy truth; thy word is the truth;' 'and the very God of peace sanctify you wholly,' says Paul to the Thessalonians, 'and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless to the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ.' Christians, then, are to 'follow peace with all men, and sanctification, without which no one shall see the Lord.' Therefore, it is the duty and the work of Christians 'to *perfect* holiness in the fear of the Lord.' "

Can any one imagine a more gross and pointed misrepresentation? "*Brother* Fuller" is the author of these calumnies, the most gifted and biblical preacher among them. As proof of his high advances in sacred literature, he says, p. 9.—

"We think we could easily show that the present Sunday was the original Sabbath at the creation."

What a profound discovery! To expose such a pretender and such misrepresentation would indeed be a work of supererogation.

A. C.

QUESTIONS.

1. To whom is a bishop (when there is but one) amenable for improper proceedings, or the inculcation of false principles?

2. What shall be done with a bishop who maintains that the appointment has placed him above the rebuke of his brethren for any thing, and that he is only amenable to a *council of bishops!* who can and does talk faster and louder than any member of the society, and has seldom sufficient decorum to hear out any objections to his views, and by this course carries many of his points; and supports his assumption of powers with similitudes like these: A bishop of a church is like the captain of a ship, the members like the sailors—the captain's orders, you know, must be obeyed without inquiring into their propriety. Again—the carpenter, at the raising of a building, must also be obeyed implicitly in order to success—*the* bishop likened to him. Several other similitudes could be transcribed.

3. Has not such a bishop fairly fallen, as Paul apprehended of young converts?

Answers to the above are respectfully solicited.

Answer to Query 1. The Christian system makes no provision for one bishop in a church. It supposes a plurality in all cases. And I presume the case you have adduced is a full demonstration of the wisdom and necessity of a plurality. Still as the church of Christ in all the world is one church, made up of many independent congregations; when parties agree to refer a matter from one church to another, as to a committee from different congregations, there is no better way of settling difficulties in a free and voluntary one, than by such a reference. This is my *opinion*.

Query 2. Such a *Diotrephes* had better be permitted to lord it over himself. The church can do this for him by giving him a letter of recommendation to those who desire to have over them a sprig from the papal tree—a little *pontifex maximus*. Such arrogance proves him to have been weighed in the scales and to be found wanting.

The trying of a bishop by a council of bishops, unless by an express agreement, is like trying a Governor of New York by the Governors of Ohio and Pennsylvania—a case without law, without precedent, and consequently without authority. A. C.

STATISTICS OF THE UNITED STATES.

The following statistics are gathered from the American Almanac for 1840.

Literary and Religious Institutions.

There are 95 Colleges in the United States.
27 Medical Schools.
37 Theological Schools.
8 Law Schools.

Religious Denominations in the Union.

Baptists, (of different denominations,)	4,300,000
Methodists,	3,000,000
Presbyterians,	2,175,000
Congregationalists,	1,000,000
Episcopalians,	800,000
Christ-ians,	800,000
Universalists,	600,000
Roman Catholics,	800,000
Lutherans,	540,000
Dutch Reformed,	450,000

Besides a great many other denominations, not so numerous as the foregoing.

Newspapers, Magazines, &c.	1,555
Daily Papers,	126
Locomotive and Railroad Engines in the United States,	650

Massachusetts has 37, and Maine 2.

There are over 800 Steam-Boats in the Union; 8 of which are in Maine, and 140 in New York.

DR. ANDREW WYLIE,

The President of Bloomington College, Indiana, has presented to the Christian public a valuable tract, of 130 pages, 8vo. titled "*Sectarianism is Heresy*—in three parts—its Nature, Evils, and Remedy." I have not quite finished the reading of this very seasonable, and, so

far as I have examined, most convincing performance. I will furnish some specimens in my next. Meanwhile I would recommend to every Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, Episcopalian, and Romanist in America to give this tract a careful, and, if it were possible, an impartial perusal. Besides, it will do no harm if all those of other creeds, Unitarian, Trinitarian, Sabellian, and so forth, should consecrate a few hours to its examination. A. C.

FORRESTER & CAMPBELL

Have, at much expense, completed an elegant edition of the FAMILY TESTAMENT. It is on a beautiful, new, and large type, and substantially and neatly bound. They have also on hand a supply of the CHRISTIAN SYSTEM, POCKET TESTAMENTS, our HYMN-BOOK, or PSALMS, HYMNS, and SPIRITUAL SONGS, in plain and morocco binding; together with a general assortment of our works. Orders are now being promptly filled. A. C.

☞ Communications from Elder Stone and "Diotrephes" for our next. "A Voice from the North" on Christianos is under consideration.

PROSPECTUS.

For publishing in Jeffersonville, Indiana, *The Journal of Christianity*, to be edited by *Nathaniel Field*, and printed and published by I. N. Griffith

The paper we propose to publish shall be devoted to Primitive Christianity and Literature. Bible faith and Bible practice will be taught and insisted on as true orthodoxy, and the only bond of union among Christians. All human authority in religion will be opposed as spiritual usurpation. The New Testament will be advocated as the only infallible standard of Christian faith and practice, to the exclusion of all human creeds and confessions of faith. The belief of its *facts*, and obedience to its *commands*, being the sum total of our duty to God, we shall endeavor to show that upon *that* basis a general union may be effected among the disciples of Christ, without regard to unity of opinion. We shall plead for pure Christian morality—for a religion that influences soul, body, and spirit. We shall freely canvass the diversified systems of sectarianism, and point out the causes of the schisms that prevail in Christendom. We shall freely, honorably, and charitably discuss the differences that unhappily divide professors of Christianity, and allow to *all* the right to be heard in defence of their principles and practice. Free inquiry and honest investigation after truth shall characterize our labors. We shall give intelligence of the progress of the cause of the ancient gospel and order of things in the United States and Europe, and devote a reasonable portion of our columns to Education and Literature, as indispensable to the prevalence of truth and virtue. Miscellaneous news, foreign and domestic intelligence, biographical sketches of great and good men connected with the progress of the late reformation, shall also have a place in the Journal. We shall use our best efforts to make the Journal a valuable and interesting paper to the Christian and Moralist.

Terms.—The Journal will be published weekly, in newspaper form, on an imperial sheet, at $2,00 per annum, payable in advance; $2,50 at the end of six months; or $3,00 at the end of the year.

Any person procuring five subscribers, and sending us ten dollars, shall have the sixth number of the Journal for their trouble. Post-Masters are requested to act as agents.

The first number of the Journal of Christianity will be published on Thursday, the 2d of April, 1840.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

NEW SERIES.

VOLUME IV.——NUMBER VI.

BETHANY, VA. *JUNE*, 1840.

THOUGHTS ON EVIDENCE—*No. VI.*

In boasting of the certainty of sensible evidence, people often overlook not only that rigid and long-continued *schooling* of the senses, but that peculiar *combined* and *concurring* testimony of distinct senses of which it is the result. It is natural to us to consider effects rather than causes; ends rather than means. We readily conceive the idea of a spacious and elegant mansion, furnished with every thing necessary to life and comfort; yet we are so far from forming a correct conception of the amount of time, materials, labor, attention and expense absolutely required for the accomplishment of our plan, that in the end we can scarcely credit our own experience.

How weak and ignorant are the senses of the infant! It cannot, even by its touch, distinguish one thing from another. Not one, nor all of its senses can give to it correct impressions. Its eyes are perfect in their organization, yet they afford it no just idea either of surrounding objects or of their respective distances. Every thing, indeed, appears to be equally distant or equally near, so that it reaches forth its hands to lay hold of objects the most remote from it. The faculty of smelling can scarce be perceived to exist at all, while that of taste may be easily deceived, though, from its immediate relation to life, it is the first to attain perfection in the child, and the last to abandon the aged. The sense of hearing, too, is wholly at fault. The child cannot tell from whence the sounds which it hears proceed, but if spoken to by one person, will fix its eyes upon another. It is not until, by a slow and painful process, it attains the power of locomotion, that it is enabled to correct by the sense of touch, the errors of sight; and by both of these, the mistakes of hearing.

The senses, like those engaged upon different branches of the same science, rectify each other's errors, and by communicating to one another their own peculiar discoveries, keep pace with each other, and become so equally informed, that each one is almost as learned as the whole together. Thus the eye, having been instructed by the touch, can now, without any further aid from this sense, perceive and even measure the relative distances of objects; and the sense of hearing can distinguish the nature and origin of sounds without depending any longer upon either. Each sense, then, does finally come to appropriate to itself, if not the powers, at least the experience of others; and the perceptions of a single sense may often be as certainly trusted, as the united evidence of them all. Thus one, whose senses are perfectly taught and in a healthful state, observes by the eye a certain object—suppose an apple. He at once receives the idea not only of its form and color, but of its distance, its size, its feel, its odor, and its taste, and from all these concurring qualities pronounces it to be what it is—an apple. Instructed by the sense of touch, the eye becomes indeed so skilled after repeated trials that it can detect at a considerable distance any imitation of this fruit with as much readiness as can the sense of feeling. Experience teaches us to associate always with a certain peculiarity of form and color, a particular odor, feel, and taste; and we are scarcely ever wrong in these associations. No wonder, then, that we rely so much upon the sense of seeing, and that optical illusions are so readily mistaken for realities and credited with so little hesitation.

From all that has been said upon sensible evidence we deduce, 1st. That there is a period when the senses, however acute, and however perfect so far as they depend upon the organization of the organs through which they act, are incapable of perceiving or reporting correctly for want of experience or education. 2d. That even when fully instructed, they are liable to be deluded in a most singular manner in certain morbid states of the system, and that the testimony of a single witness is in such cases sufficient to overthrow their evidence. 3d. That the correctness and credibility of their perceptions or reports arises, not from any natural or acquired infallibility in any one of them, but from the *combination* and *concurrence* of different senses, regarded as so many distinct witnesses in the case.

Now when we institute a comparison between human testimony and that of the senses, we shall find the latter defective where the former is so, and fully credible only under circumstances which give to the former equal, if not superior force. 1st. Human testimony may be defective where the witnesses are incapable of understanding the nature

of the transaction which they witness, or where they are placed in such circumstances that they cannot clearly perceive the matter itself. In this case there is no intentional misrepresentation. The error springs from inexperience, or from a limited perception which leads to wrong conclusions. 2d. As a diseased state of the senses occasions illusions, so a morbid condition of mind results in false testimony.—Prejudice distorts facts, makes wrong applications, and blends with truth its own distempered creations. 3d. On the other hand, as it respects the comparative correctness and strength of the two species of evidence, it is manifest that they rest upon precisely the same basis.—As one sense perceives certain attributes of things which are unnoticed by the others, so one witness will observe certain parts of a transaction which escape the notice of the rest. As the evidence of one sense corrects the errors and explains the perceptions of another, so the testimony of one witness rectifies and elucidates the depositions of others. And, as the strength of sensible evidence consists in the combination and concurrence of two or more senses in the perception, so the power of human testimony is found in the coincidence and agreement of the testimony of distinct witnesses. In this last respect the power of human testimony it is manifest may be much greater than that of sensible evidence. If we both see and hear, or see and feel an object of sense we feel certain of its existence, because we have the united evidence of two senses. English law has given an equal value to human testimony in making it an established principle that the concurring testimony of two disinterested witnesses can never be set aside. But waiving the question of the comparative value of these two kinds of evidence when in equal measure, it will be at once admitted that while the evidence of the senses can be but that of two for the most part, and never in any case more than five; the number of witnesses to any fact may be in any number and increased to any extent, thus multiplying and augmenting to the very highest possible degree the evidence in the case.

R. R.

ATONEMENT.

JACKSONVILLE, *Illinois*, March 30, 1840.

Brother Campbell—

LAST evening I returned from Missouri, after an absence from home of five weeks. I see in your Harbinger for February last, a friendly invitation to me to correspond with you on a number of religious subjects, which you have named. The same thing you communicated to me privately some weeks before. I then answered you that

I would take the proposal by you under consideration; but suggested to you my fears that, though we might discuss those points in a perfect Christian spirit, yet the minds of the people might be withdrawn from humble piety and devotion, to strife, contention, and division. My friends persuade me that such fears will never be realized. I have consented to comply with your invitation, though I am conscious that years have despoiled me of much of that vigor and strength of mind I may have once possessed.

All the subjects you have proposed are but so many fractions of one common denominator, which I shall call the atonement. To this they all refer.

You "affectionately solicit from me an essay on sin, and sin-offerings, scripturally setting forth the import of these terms in sacred writ."

1st. With respect to sin. "Sin is the transgression of the law." 1 John iii. 4. "To him that knoweth to do good, and doeth it not, to him it is sin." James iv. 17. From these two texts it is plain that sins are of two classes—sins of commission, and sins of omission; into which two classes, it is believed, that all are resolvable. To treat of the tendency, and evil effects, and of the awful consequences of sin, is another subject, to which reference may hereafter be made in the progress of these numbers.

2dly. Your second inquiry is respecting sin-offerings. With regard to the victims offered for sin, as lambs, bullocks, goats, and the great antitype, the Lamb of God, there can be but one sentiment in the Christian world—and that these victims for sin were offered to God, admits of no doubt. But the purpose, why these offerings were made to God for sin, has been, and yet is variously set forth by good, but erring men. Their discrepant, jarring systems on this subject, has long been the fruitful soil of discord, strife, and division.

Doctor A. Clark, on Lev. i. describes the purpose, end, or design of sacrifices or offerings for sin, thus: "By the imposition of hands, the person bringing the victim acknowledged, 1st. The sacrifice as his own. 2d. That he offered it as an atonement for his sins. 3d. That he was worthy of death, because he had sinned, having forfeited his life by breaking the law. 4th. That he entreated God to accept the life of the innocent animal in place of his own. 5th. And, all this to be done profitably, must have respect to Him whose life in the fulness of time should be made a sacrifice for sin." From the 3d, 4th, and 5th items of this paragraph I must dissent, for the want of evidence, and because they stand in direct opposition to the sacred scriptures. The law admitted no person worthy of death, or who had forfeited his life by breaking the law, to offer a victim for sin. Sins of ignorance, and ceremonial defilement, only admitted of sacrifice for purification. Therefore the death of the victim could not be in the stead of the death of the offerer, seeing his sin did not require his death. But the Doctor says farther, that the offerer, in order to be profited, must have respect to Him whose life in the fulness of time should be made a sacrifice for sin. I know it is a common opinion that the Israelites under the law always looked through their sacrifices to Christ the Lamb of God, who died on Calvary, without which view they could not be profited.—Paul thought differently: he declared that the veil was on their heart,

that they could not stedfastly look to the end of that which is abolished. Now the thing abolished is sacrifices, and Christ was the end. Did they see this end in their offerings? Did the Jewish nation believe that Christ was to die? No: for when he taught them this truth, they said, "We have heard out of the law that Christ abideth for ever." Christ crucified to the Jews was always a stumbling block, and is to this day to that unhappy people. The disciples of Jesus themselves could not believe that Christ was to die and rise again, till the facts proved the truth.

From these remarks it is evident that the Doctor, and all who think as he does, are mistaken. The design of the legal sacrifices was not to deliver from death, but to purify and cleanse the offerer, and thus make an *atonement* or reconciliation between him and his God and the congregation—before this purification was effected by sacrifice, he was separated by his sin and uncleanness from the fellowship of the congregation, not being permitted to enter the tabernacle and worship with them there.

This perfectly accords with the inspired views of the great commentater on Moses, Heb. ix. 22. "And almost all things by the law are purged with blood, and without shedding of blood is no remission." One exception of the "all things purged with blood" by the law, is, the person guilty of a sin worthy of death he must die without mercy under two or three witnesses—by the law there is no remission without shedding of blood, and as he is debarred by law from an offering for his sin, if he is forgiven, his forgiveness is not by sacrifice, or shedding of blood. Why does my brother Campbell so confidently assert that "without shedding of blood there *never was* remission of sin"? *Christian System*, page 37. Was every moral transgresser under the law, and before the law, cut off by death, unforgiven? Though condemned by law to certain death, could not the penitent offender find mercy and forgiveness by the law of faith, as did Abraham the father of us all, and as did many others recorded in the scriptures?

There are others who view the purpose or design of sin-offerings to be for reconciling God to us; so the Methodist Discipline states, that the death of Christ reconciled the Father to us. As this assertion is destitute of all scripture testimony, and as enlightened reason fails to lend her aid in its support, I pass it by as a relic of unauthorized tradition, probably taken from heathen mythology, or pagan customs. The pagans offered human as well as brute sacrifices for the purpose of appeasing or reconciling their angry gods to them; but this cannot be the design of divine sacrifices, whether under the Old or New Testament.

I am sorry my brother Campbell has very similar views with those just stated. You say, "Sacrifice atones and reconciles. It propitiates God and reconciles man. It is the cause, and these are its effects on heaven and earth, on God and man." *Christian System*, page 36. The sacrifice of Christ then, in your opinion, has an effect on heaven—on God, to *propitiate* him to man. "To propitiate is to appease one offended, and to render him favorable." *Webster*. Do, brother Campbell, point us to the scriptures that say that sacrifices either under the Old or New Testament, were ever designed to propitiate God, or that such an effect was ever produced or effected on him. This, to me,

would be more convincing than volumes of speculations and philosophic reasoning from uncertain premises. Indeed, I think my brother has advanced a few steps farther than any other system-maker, when you say that "every sin wounds the affection of our heavenly Father," and that the death of Christ "soothes and delights the wounded love of our kind and benignant heavenly Father." *Christian System*, page 48, 49.

This is a strange *speech* to me; but if this be the doctrine or language of the Bible, do show it to us. Till then I shall be silent.

Others think that Christ by his death or sacrifice "magnified the law and made it honorable." Isaiah xlii. 21. Whether this text has any reference to Messiah is very doubtful. The context is against the idea. But admitting that the Messiah is intended, is it said that the law was magnified and made honorable by his sacrifice? Is there one hint of this in the text?—in the Bible? I can clearly see how he magnified the law and made it honorable, in his exposition of it in Matth. v. There he shows how spiritual, how extensive it was, extending from the sinful act to the very fountain of sin in the heart—he made it honorable in submitting to be made under it, and fulfilling every jot and tittle of it. Had it been a bad, dishonorable law, he would not have done it such honor. Did he, as the substitute of sinners, suffer the punishment which the violated law required of sinners in their stead, and thus pay their debts, that pardon might be granted consistently with the honors of law? By what inspired writer is this taught? I cannot find.

I have only hinted at the different theories current on the subject of sin-offerings, none of which can I receive without better testimony than I have yet seen. This I have done to prepare the way to state my own. For another number I must reserve that exposition. My avocations are many, and therefore I may be prevented from sending my communications regularly. Try to exercise patience with me. I have introduced a few sentiments of yours from your *Christian System*, in order that you may, if possible, establish them by plain scripture, and not in the wisdom of words. If they be found true, I shall joyfully receive them. May the Lord direct your mind and pen to the edification of the saints!

B. W. STONE.

A. C.'s REPLY TO B. W. STONE.

Brother Stone,

Dear Sir—I most cordially concur in opinion with those brethren who have persuaded you that your fears were groundless, or would "never be realized," concerning the discussion of those points which you called for, under date of your letter of November 11, 1839, published page 21st of the current volume. The discussion of any of the grand elementary principles of the remedial or evangelical economy, "*in a truly Christian spirit*," never can, in my judgment, "withdraw the minds of the people from humble piety and devotion to strife, contion, and division." Shall those who love truth and peace fear that this love of peace and of truth, if fully developed, will issue in strife or impiety!

When in your kind epistle of November 11th, you asked me for my definition of a *Unitarian*, and assured me that you denied the name, though often applied to yourself, and urged me to say whether I "designed to co-operate with Trinitarians against Unitarians," &c. I felt it my duty to make the proposition alluded to in your letter of March 30th. I have done so in the full persuasion that the contemplated discussion is not only expedient, but necessary, and that it can be so managed as to disabuse the public mind of injurious prejudices both against you and myself. You have long disavowed Unitarianism, and I have also disavowed Trinitarianism and every other sectarianism in the land; and therefore that morbid state of feeling elicited by these partizan wars about the polemical abstrusities of metaphysical abstractions, which, in its excessive irritability, forbids the scriptural investigation of the great points which have been so often distorted and mangled on the racks and wheels of party discord and proscription, should have no abiding in our minds, much less prohibit a scriptural examination of the facts, and precepts, and promises, on which these unhallowed theories have been reared.

The fear of irritating these old sectarian sores has, I verily opine, kept the minds of many brethren and of the public in suspense, if not in comparative darkness, upon the greatest questions in this earthly world. There is no subject so vital to man as the death of Christ.—The designs of his death are interwoven with all the designs of the universe, and are replete with the temporal, spiritual, and eternal destinies of man. Christ crucified is the most transcendant mystery in the moral dominions of God. Its power is the mainspring of all heavenly impulses, and it is itself the consummation of all divine wisdom and prudence. As all earthly waters arise from the ocean and descend to it, so the deep and the high counsels of God issue in this mysterious fact and emanate from it.

The subjects to which I invited your attention, my venerable brother —viz. Sin, Sin-offerings, Sacrifice for Sin, Atonement,"* &c. you very justly regard as terminating in what is usually called *the atonement*, or as all summed up in it. True, the doctrine of what is usually called "the atonement" is made to include the whole; but I designed no trite nor common-place examination of this subject, as it issues from the fiery furnace of sectarian zeal and bigoted devotion. I wish to explore the scriptural roots and grounds, the remote and the immediate connexions, bearings, and designs of "*the Blood of the New Institution.*"—I am glad, therefore, that you have so promptly advanced to the subject, and I most sincerely supplicate the FATHER OF LIGHTS to subdue our spirits and to imbue them with the holy spirit of the gospel of

* Page 82, vol. iv.

Christ; that, with all piety, benevolence, Christian meekness and mildness, we may examine this great subject—so necessary to right conceptions of God, of Christ, and of ourselves.

You properly begin with *sin*. Its existence, nature, and tendencies gave birth to the redemption that is in Christ Jesus our Lord. Wrong conceptions of this thing necessarily cast their penumbra over the Bible, and obscure all its golden treasures. I object not to your definition of *sin*, so far as it goes. You give us the word of the Lord for sin, as a violation of a law, and a neglect of it—commission of wrong, and omission of right. Your quotations are apposite and striking. I will only add a definition in *fact*. There are definitions by words, and definitions by facts. Sin is the cause of death; or "*the wages of sin is death*," is verbal; but when we see Satan lose heaven, Adam lose Eden, and millions of infants lose life, we have a definition in fact, that death follows sin as the shadow follows the substance standing in light. Sin, then, is a mortal thing. Death is in it. "The soul that sinneth it shall die." I emphasize on this, because of its bearings upon all bloody sacrifices—upon sin-offerings—upon the havoc of life under the Patriarchal and Jewish institutions.

2d. On sin-offerings as presented to God, all cordially harmonize; but, you say, not so on "the *purpose*" of them. You then review Doctor Adam Clark, and dissent from his conclusions. He is public property, and you have a right to lay on your warrant. I shall not dispute your right. You pronounce three of his conclusions, in your opinion, as in direct opposition to the sacred scriptures. Of course his friends will pronounce your conclusions in these three points, as, in their opinion, in direct opposition to the sacred scriptures; and thence we have Dr. Adam Clark and Dr. B. W. Stone as affirmative and negative; and their friends all take their station accordingly.

But you are led to express some important conclusions which involve some great scriptural facts, of which I am not so sure. These are:—

1. "Sins of ignorance and ceremonial defilement only admitted of sacrifice for purification." These sins you do not consider as deserving of death; and therefore you conclude that "*the death of the victim could not be instead of the death of the offerer*"—"seeing," you add, "his sin did not require his death." Your view, then, is, that the law made no provision for any sins but those of ignorance or legal defilement—that these were not mortal sins; and consequently the sin-offerings of the law saved no one from death. Nay, you assert that "the law admitted no person worthy of death, or who had forfeited his life by breaking the law to offer a victim for sin." These are very important propositions, and deeply penetrate the whole subject of sin-offerings.—

If legal atonement or expiation was made only for sins of ignorance or legal defilement, then they could not be typical of the death of Christ, else the death of Christ expiates only sins of ignorance. I must then conclude my brother Stone has expressed himself obscurely, or I have misconceived his meaning: for certainly he admits that the legal sacrifices were types of the true; and that the true sacrifice expiates more than sins of ignorance: for surely brother Stone believes that all manner of sins, excepting one, may be forgiven, because the blood of Jesus Christ cleanses from *all* sin. There is a radical mistake here: I trust it is in my misconception of your meaning.

But is it a *fact* that the legal sacrifices and offerings expiate sins of ignorance only? Read Leviticus vi. 1. "If a soul sin and commit a trespass against the Lord, and lie unto his neighbor in that which was delivered him to keep, or in trade, or in a thing taken away by violence, or has deceived his neighbor, or has found that which was lost, and *lieth* concerning it, and sweareth falsely in any of all these things that a man doeth sinning therein, then it shall be because he has sinned and is *guilty;* he shall make restitution, add one-fifth to it, and bring his offering to the priest; and the priest shall make an atonement [an expiation] for him; and it shall be forgiven him for any thing that he has done in trespassing therein." Do you call these "sins of ignorance or legal impurities?" or do you consider that there was no expiation or atonement made for them? I have been in error for many years if these were sins of ignorance or legal impurities, or if the law had no sin-offerings but for such sins as you have enumerated. I agree with you in differing in some points from Dr. Clark; but I cannot go quite so far as you go in these three items. But I have to do with Moses and Paul, and not with our erudite Doctors living or dead.

There is but one character for whom the law and for whom the gospel makes no purifying sacrifice. This is the man who presumptuously despised Moses and the Holy Spirit, or who renounces either dispensation. One of us may have mistaken this case. You say, "The law admitted *no person* worthy of death, or who had forfeited his life by breaking the law, to offer a victim for sin." You might have said, 'The gospel admits *no person* who, under it, has forfeited his life by despising or renouncing it, to any forgiveness through Christ's sacrifice; for to such Paul says, "There remaineth no more sacrifice for sin; but the mistake, as it appears to me, consists in making out of a single case, or class of character, a general law against wilful transgressors. Hence you conclude that wilful transgressors of law, or those who sinned wittingly under the law, could

find no sin-offering. This would, indeed, be a complete annihilation of the typical character of all the Jewish sin-offerings; and would, so far as it goes, exclude the hope of forgiveness through the antitypical sin-offering every person who had sinned wittingly or wilfully in any matter against God or man. I especially request your views of Lev. vi. 1–7., and more especially I call your attention to the great annual and national expiation minutely detailed Lev, xvi. In this chapter we are told most unequivocally that when the priest laid his hands upon the scape-goat he was to confess over him all the iniquities of the children of Israel, and all their transgressions in all their sins, putting them upon the head of the scape-goat; and again, the goat shall bear upon him "*all their iniquities;*" and again, "the priest shall make an atonement for you, to cleanse you, that you may be clean from *all your sins.*" "This shall be an everlasting statute to you to make an atonement for the children of Israel for *all their sins* once a-year." But I will not exhaust this subject at one effort, especially as I may have misunderstood you. Your allusions to the "*Christian System,*" and quotations therefrom, shall all be considered in due time. I shall be exceedingly thankful to you, my aged and venerable brother, to examine that work with the utmost care, and to point out to me any ambiguous or erroneous expressions in it, as I may probably soon be called upon to *stereotype* it. The demand for it is very great, and I have had the most flattering intimations of its usefulness to the public from numerous and eminent quarters of the professing world.*

Give me leave to add, that I concur most sincerely with you in your objections to the Methodistic notion of sacrifices reconciling God to us. There must be some great obscurity in my style if you could infer from any thing I have ever written, that I entertain such an idea. When I speak of sacrifice as propitiating or pacifying the Divine Father, (a scriptural idea truly,) I intend no more, as I have explained myself, than opening a way in which his favor might shine forth. The opening of a vent for water to flow is making it to flow: so the opening a way for God to be propitious, is making him propitious, in all propriety of language—as appears to yours, most sincerely and affectionately,

A. CAMPBELL.

* An involuntary misquotation, and consequent misrepresentation of my views, appears in one of your principal quotations from page 49. You put a clause in page 48 with one in page 49, and startled me no little, as no doubt you will have done every other reader. You make me say that "the death of Christ soothes and delights the wounded love of our kind and benignant heavenly Father. p. 48, 49." Whereas I say, "The death of Christ, in *bringing many sons to glory*, soothes and delights," &c. A very different idea truly! You make me say of a subject abstractly, what I say of it only in connexion with its consequences. The difference between these two forms of expression would jeopardize any man's life in many courts civil and ecclesiastic. I am aware you did not intend such a thing. In none of the three instances in which you have quoted the C. S. am I understood as I intended, or, as I think, my language indicates. This I attribute to your writing so immediately after your return from Missouri, before you had time to weigh the periods from which you quoted.

RICHMOND, *April* 10, 1840.

AN ADDRESS FROM EPHESUS TO THE APOSTLE PAUL.

To the Right Reverend PAUL, *Traveller Plenipotentiary, from Jerusalem to Illiricum*—GREETING:

YOUR gracious epistle, inculcating every virtue and deprecating every vice, was duly received by your Christian acquaintances in this place. Our souls are filled with emulation by your touching appeals to us to be good soldiers of Jesus Christ. About the "heavenly armor" you are truly eloquent: many of us think you surpassed yourself in the conclusion of your epistle. We imagine that we see you in "the school of Tyrannus," where we heard you deliver your "regular course" on all the distinguishing doctrines of theology. Many of the citizens who worship at the "Temple of Diana" retain a pleasing remembrance of you, and say that your eloquence was near converting them to the Christian faith. Our elegant ladies say, that if we had the benefit of your preaching here, they should, on your account, (and especially if we would construct a Temple after the fashion of Diana's) attend your place of worship, Oh! it would delight our souls to see the fashionable community turn their steps of grace and taste towards our Christian meetings! When you were with us we asked you if you knew any thing about Apollos: have you learned where he is? If you could persuade him to come and take the "pastoral charge," we could support him in a very genteel manner. Our sisters would exert themselves in every way to make him comfortable. Several have said they would sell their superfluous jewelry to decorate his pulpit. Oh! he looks so handsome in the sacred desk! His voice is so melodious; his manner so winning; and he sings, too, most delightfully! The sisters think that many of the idolators would subscribe very liberally towards his support. They like the idea you gave them about Dorcas and her good works: they have therefore established a Dorcas Society, and each seamstress lends her hand. The proceeds are to be appropriated either to the support of "the ministry," or to the education of young men of promising talents, who may drink at the fountains of eloquence, and be able to eclipse the orators of the Areopagus itself.—Young men should study Socrates, think with Plato, be emulous with Cicero, and thunder with Demosthenes.

Most charitably do we acquit you of any neglect in not calling our attention to these things in your beautiful epistle. Nothing but the fact that Nero called to give you a ride in his chariot, could have made you send us so laconic a letter. We made this excuse for you to our friends, and one of our fashionable ladies said she should have been delighted to have seen your cloak floating on the wind, for Nero is the most furious charioteer of this age. We try as much as we can to make a favorable impression on the people of this great city. To this end we decorate our daughters with all the fashions of Rome; and such is the gallantry of the young men of this place, that they accompany our "fair ones" to meeting, though they should sleep and dream about "the great goddess' all the while our services are performing. It has been insinuated that you were opposed to the ladies'

decorating their persons—wearing gold rings and chains, wearing furs and curled hair, &c.; and they have said that you disapproved of these things in one of your polite epistles: but we have contended that if you did say so, it must have been to a church living and meeting in the country, where it was useless to display taste, and where, if the ladies put on fine clothes or costly array, it might all be spoiled in a shower of rain. We rely upon what we have heard you say ourselves, that you "become all things to all men;" and, of course, we say, *to women too.*

The church of Jesus Christ is a city set on a hill, that it may see all that is around it, and turn to its own account all the movements of this world. There is a custom among us which answers admirably in raising money for all benevolent purposes. There are a great many institutions called "benevolent societies," of which we cannot speak particularly; suffice it to say, that money is raised to buy sacrifices for the poor, to furnish destitute families with silver shrines of Diana, &c. &c. The people of the world were living long before the Christians were born; and therefore, as the scripture says, "the elder must serve the younger"—that is, give them the benefits of their experience. The institution we have in our eye is of the following character:—It is an old and unrefined manner of proceeding to go right to persons, *sans ceremonie*, and ask them for money towards rearing a temple of religious worship. In order, therefore, to feed the taste and tap the pocket, we advertise that there will be an "exhibition of articles" at a public place, at such a time, for such a purpose. The articles consist of what is curious, fanciful, and entertaining. At the time appointed we fix the tables and display the nick-nacks, and select all the beautiful *belles* of our politest class of society. These beautiful, fascinating, and captivating young ladies invite the visiters, and especially the gentlemen, to buy the wares provided for the occasion. On such occasions they display their charms to fine advantage; and thus, while they playfully and innocently serve themselves by the display of a little coquetry with young gentlemen, they also minister to the support of our "holy religion." It is customary, too, for them to make cakes and divide them into twenty parts, and to deposite a gold ring in one of the pieces. The parts are then sold, each for a piece of silver, and he who buys the cake with the ring in it has it. Besides, some of our older sisters, who know the world, write letters and fill them with flattery and professions of love; and as the young gentlemen come into our assemblies their names are put on and the letter handed to them with the charge of postage. These are some of the innocent ways in which we make money.

In yours to us you say, "Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them." By this we understand you to mean that we are not to do any thing in the dark, but to do all in open day-light, or by candle-light. We thank you, brother Paul, for that word "unfruitful." Of course you do not condemn such institutions as the above, for they are *very fruitful.* If it were not, indeed, in our power somewhat to gratify the taste of the people, we should never become popular in the world. Fine houses, accomplished orators, a tasty and fashionable flock will always succeed, and the gates of poverty will never prevail against them.

There is one annoyance, however, to which we are subject under the present arrangement of our meetings: the mechanics of every description, with their wives and children, mix up with all the merchants and all the genteel part of our society. This is a pity; for very often our well-dressed ladies have to be seated by a poor mechanic's wife, who is unceremoniously familiar, and who is very apt by vulgar movements to mangle a costly veil or mash the richest robe, or soil their splendid fashionable st—gs. However, we can turn all this to good account by and by. The church is not able of itself to erect a "stately edifice" without the assistance of the citizens. We intend to build one which will surpass every public building in the place for taste and ornament; and then we shall sell the privilege of sitting in the conspicuous parts of the house to the highest bidder. This will effectually place the poor under the galleries and behind the door, to themselves; for the carpenters smell so strong of shavings, and the blacksmith of steel-filings, that you will agree with us that it is a proof of our refinement to put them to themselves. The poor, as is natural enough, tell us that there is no difference between the rich and the poor in Christ, and they quote your language to prove it; but we tell them you meant *in heaven*, not *here*; we show this from your own words—"Condescend to men of low estate;" that is, the rich are to condescend to meet in the same place of worship with the poor; the rich on velvet cushions; the poor, to keep them humble, to stand or kneel as they can behind the door. The rich are to "condescend" once in three months to bow to them at the breaking up of meeting, on a wet Sunday, when none of the world are there; and once in a year to shake them by the hand to show them we are yet in fellowship.

Another thing we would not overlook, for we wish to show you that we are progressing in every good work: Many of our sisters have husbands who are idolators; but though they may approve and sustain idolatry with their heads, our sisters make them help with their pockets. They try to please them in every thing to get money from them, and then they faithfully place it in our treasury; and besides, they have a tender regard for many of our members, which they have not, they say, even to their own husbands; this feeling is especially manifested by them to the preachers of our denomination. They understand exactly that elegant injunction of yours—"Do good to all, but *especially to the household of faith.*"

There have been some splendid exhibitions in the amphitheatre lately. Several gladiators have won everlasting laurels. Some of our young sisters attracted universal attention at the exhibitions.

We would write more, but we have to attend a "sacred concert" to-night, which is to be supported by all parties; some splendid performers from Corinth and Athens are here. One of the best singers in the world will sing a *solo* to "the immortal gods," which we expect will be very fine.

Accept, dear "father in the faith," the thanks of the church, and be assured of their unceasing regards.

[By order of the church.]

DIOTREPHES.

SECTARIANISM IS HERESY.

"SECTARIANISM IS HERESY, in three parts; in which are shown, its Nature, Evils, and Remedy—By A. WYLIE.—"Behold how good and how pleasant a thing it is for brethren to dwell together in unity" *David*. "There is no virtue greater than that which reunites scattered and separated parts" *Cryseostom*. "Inveniuntent fortitan necessaria, nisi et superflua quæissent" *Seneca*.

"Non monstrare vias eadem nisi sacra colenti
Quæsitum ad fontem solos deducere verpos"—*Juvenal*

"*Bloomington, Ind.*, 1840."

SUCH is the title-page of an octavo treatise of 130 pages. It is no false flag. The proposition on the envelope is fully sustained in the work. Dr. Wylie is well known in all the West, not merely as having been the President of Canonsburg and Washington Colleges, Pa. and now of Bloomington, Ia.; but also as a Doctor of Divinity of the Presbyterian church, and as well qualified by native talent, literary eminence, and moral worth, to fill those stations, high and responsible though they be, as any other Doctor in that community.

The treatise before me is in the form of a trialogue. The persons in discourse are three—Timothy, Guardezfoi, and Democop. The first personates Mr. Wylie; the second, a staunch Calvinist; the third, a Wesleyan Methodist. The style is clear, nervous, forcible, and spirited, and the conversations are well conducted to the close.

Mr. Wylie divests the book called the "Westminster Confession of Faith" of every attribute of a confession of *faith*, and gives it the character which we have given it—a declaration of abstract opinions, tenets, or dogmas. We can only quote a few passages from this convincing treatise:—

"*Timothy*. I addressed you both. And as you are at liberty to show wherein I have misquoted or misapplied Paul, I hope you will not be backward, in turn, to do me the same compliment when I deserve it. Passing by the impropriety that there is in the very name of the book which my friend Guardezfoi here calls one of his standards, 'The Confession of Faith'——

G. What, then, would you have it called?

T. Any thing rather than a *Confession of Faith*, inasmuch as simple people may be, and some doubtless are, led by it to suppose that if they, in the language of Bourdaloue describing his humble faith, 'believe in its truth, without any other evidence that God has revealed it than this only, that men like themselves,' viz. the Westminster Divines, 'declare it so to be,' and declare this to be the confession of their faith; they, of course, have faith, in the scriptural sense of that term, and so are safe. Let it be called a summary of doctrines, if you please, or rather, the doctrines or tenets of the Westminster Divines——

D. Or rather, *the errors* of the Westminster Divines; or, the errors of Calvinism.

T. Whether errors or truths does not affect the question now before us; I shall not, therefore, say any thing about that, but leave it for you and Guardeztoi to settle between you, as best you may. Passing, I say, over the name, I should like to know why you, Mr. G., have adopted this book; not as the confession of your faith, for that, I suppose, you see to be absurd; but as the expression of your opinions on theology: is it because you have thoroughly and painfully investigated all these knotty questions which it contains, and weighed the evidence for and against them?

G. Few of our most profound Divines, I imagine, have done that.

T. Why then do you adopt the book?

G. O, as matter of convenience, and to prevent the endless discord that would ensue.

A. A matter of convenience! And there you are convicted of being carnal. It is a very convenient thing, no doubt, to have a book which a body of people may wear as a badge of distinction, which whoever wears will be cherished, *in the spirit of the brotherhood*, and that in proportion to his zeal in defending it! A very convenient thing, too, no doubt it is, whenever a man makes his appearance, who, from his situation, talents, learning, or reputation, becomes an object of envy to his brethren, to have this same book at hand as an instrument to crush him!

G. Do you accuse me of such things?

T. I accuse nobody. I have never yet, however, found the man—clergyman or layman—and I have conversed with not a few on the subject,—who would acknowledge, *in private*, that he believed *every* thing in that book, taking the words of it in their plain, literal, obvious meaning. By very few, indeed, in the Presbyterian church are opinions in theology entertained which coincide, in all points, with the language of the 'Confession.' Their opinions, in fact, are not derived from this book, but from the Bible and from the discourses of Divines, whether read in books or heard from Sabbath to Sabbath, from the lips of the living teacher; who himself seldom thinks of the creed which was composed for him by the Westminster Divines; but in his preparations for the pulpit goes directly to his Bible, which he interprets for himself, under the guidance of that sense of his own spiritual wants which every good man constantly feels. He takes for granted, all the while, that his preaching is in accordance with 'the Confession of Faith,' and so do his hearers. In fact, neither he nor they ever think of comparing the one with the other. He refers them to another standard, and tells them to 'search the scriptures' for the truth of what he utters. His discourses being practical, he finds no occasion for introducing even the mention of the abstruse and knotty questions of theology. In truth, his secret persuasion is, that to do so would not be for their edification; so that these parts of 'the system' are virtually laid aside as useless lumber. In the mean time it may be said that he preaches according to the system of Calvinism; but it is modified and explained, and in various ways softened down and smoothed off by reducing its sharp corners, that it remains no longer that rugged and craggy thing which it seems to be, as presented in 'the Standards of *our* church.' It is, indeed, utterly impossible to express, in short compass, the different parts of so vast a theory as that of Calvin, so

as not to present, somewhere, the appearance of absurdity or contradiction. The very first sentence of the 'Confession' exhibits a case of this kind: 'Although the light of nature, and the works of creation and providence, do, so far, manifest the goodness, wisdom, and power of God, as to leave men inexcusable; yet they are not sufficient to give that knowledge of God and of his will which is necessary unto salvation.' Take this sentence by itself, and aside from all modification and explanation, and it contains a shocking absurdity—since it implies that God has placed the greater part of the human race in circumstances which *necessarily* insure their eternal condemnation, and which, nevertheless, render them *inexcusable;* two things that are in palpable and glaring contradiction, one to the other: since necessity and blame cannot meet in the same case, the one always excluding the other. I am perfectly aware that Calvinists have explained away the difficulty in a manner satisfactory to themselves, and in a manner too, that, perhaps, ought to satisfy every candid and considerate mind that is capable of taking into view the whole system, if not respecting the truth of the system itself, at least respecting the magnitude of the difficulty that stands in its way. But, in the explanation of the difficulty, nice distinctions must be made, and a chain of arguments must be followed out, from point to point, through a vast and thorny region, which none but the boldest spirits have attempted to explore, and none but the vainest have ever supposed they had explored sufficiently. Since, then, the opinion contained in the very first sentence of your 'Confession' is, at best, but a doubtful opinion, which, without a great deal of explanation and modification, cannot be made to appear even plausible, how preposterous is it to set it down as an *article of faith*, and in the very front of the whole; as if for the purpose of erecting, at the very threshold of your communion, a barrier, to repel such as the Apostle has commanded you to receive—such, namely, as are 'weak in the faith;' or, to speak more correctly, *all* who, in the language of Bourdaloue, who have not that happy '*humility of spirit*' which boggles at nothing which has the authority of 'mother church' to recommend it, however repugnant it may be to the moral sense and reason of mankind! The same may be said respecting the dogma of reprobation, which, as the Confession states it, strongly savors of supralapsarianism, a part of 'the system' which nobody, so far as I know, now believes, whether in your church or out of it. There are, doubtless, not a few who, as you say, acquiesce in the use—or, I should say, abuse—of the standards as a matter of convenience; and because they were handed down by tradition from the fathers; and because they serve as terms of union and communion among the members of a particular church. But, while they answer these purposes of convenience, they answer another purpose—that of heresy; rending the church of Jesus Christ; making divisions between those who reciprocally acknowledge each other as his disciples—and affording opportunities for those to act with greater effect, whose delight it is to sow discord among brethren. For, as to their preventing discord, they have—perhaps I should say rather, the abuse of them, has—multiplied discord and strife a thousand fold. I say, the abuse of them; for I should not be opposed so much to these summaries of doctrine, were they not employed to divide those who are one in the faith.

G. How can that be? Were you and I one in the faith, we would both adopt the same creed, the same standards; would we not?

T. Alas, the pernicious force of evil habit! When men will persist in using forms of speech without meaning, or having a meaning that they reject! Have not you and Mr. Democop the same faith in God and Jesus Christ, the sent of God?

G. Yes, I hope so, or we would not account each other Christians.

T. You are one in the faith, then, are you not?

G I must admit it.

T. Yet *you* are *for* this book, this creed, about which we have been talking; and he *against* it: that is, your *faith* is the same, your *opinions different.*

G. I see it now. Creeds are designed to make people agree in opinion.

T. And hence their name of standards. A yard-stick is the standard by which you measure cloth. What do you think Christians did when they had no better standard than "the Law and the Testimony?"

The spirit of sectarianism, or heresy, is justly described in the following statements:—

"This practice of extracting from the Bible materials for a system is attended with this further danger, that the constructors of the system place those parts of it which, it may be, are clearly contained in the Bible, or fairly deducible from it, on the same level with those other parts of their system, which, indeed, have no other foundation than their own authority, supported with whatever show of reasoning they may have been able to make. This may be quite satisfactory to themselves. But still, it is no more than their own reasoning, and ought not to be placed on the same footing with the word of God. Nay, it is not at all improbable that the spirit of sect induces some to proceed even farther than this, and to lay down the principles of their reasoning, their system, their creed, as the standard to which the Bible itself must be made to bend. Such teachers, did they candidly speak out, would say to their disciples, 'Search the scriptures, make them the man of your council, a light to your feet and a lamp to your path. Read them, and study them diligently; *but understand them according to the creed.*' Is not the Catholic church more consistent, when she says to her private members, 'Read not the Bible at all; for you cannot understand it. Learn from the Priest what is contained in that holy book.'

It is seldom that men engaged as a party in any cause are themselves fully aware of the motives by which they are actuated, and of the secret strength of habit and education in determining the amount and direction of that zeal which inflames them. I add, therefore, in the third place, that the tendency of this practice of making systems in theology and elevating them into standards of orthodoxy, is to generate and maintain a spirit of partial fondness towards the brethren of the same creed, and of indifference, unkindness, and even hostility towards those who are not. The peculiarities of the creed become the badges of the party; by which all of the party distinguish a friend from a foe. And these peculiarities are the mere insisted on because they *are* peculiarities; the very reason why they should be regarded as of small

importance. For, it will not be denied, I suppose, by any but the most blinded and obstinate bigots, that those things in Christianity, which all sects hold in common, are precisely the things that are of essential importance; while the points on which they differ are, for the most part, comparatively insignificant. Yet each sect, when it comes to be the question as to their own peculiarities, recede from what, in the general, they were so ready to grant, and magnify to themselves the merest trifles, just because they are the distinctive marks of the sect. They constitute their badge, and their badge must not be parted with. Does not this look like a determination to perpetuate the divisions which heresy has made?

To show, in a still clearer light, the nature of this element of sectarianism on which we are now remarking, let it be asked, Who are the persons to insist the most on the distinguishing points of their sect, and to push them into the greatest extreme? If I mistake not, they will generally be found to be persons in whom there is but very little of the spirit—persons the least distinguished for piety and moral worth. In all cases where party violence prevails, the most worthless of the party are sure to carry their violence to the greatest length—to insist most on keeping up the party distinctions, and to denounce, in the strongest terms, those who are not of the party. In this way they think to make conspicuous their zeal for their party, a virtue which seldom has to wait long for its reward. If, as before stated, party distinctions may be considered as so many badges, used to distinguish brethren of the fraternity from strangers and aliens; or, perhaps I should rather say, as so many standards, around which the separate hostile bands are arrayed for battle; then he who wears his badge the most conspicuously, and advances his standard in the face of the enemy with the most portly bearing, and the most show of zeal and gallantry, is likely to gain credit for most devotion to the honor and interests of his party. Hence we find that the most zealous partizans of the different sects have rarely failed to carry much farther the offensive peculiarities of the sect, than did the original founders of the sect themselves. It is no uncommon thing to find Calvinists far more Calvinistic than Calvin, and Wesleyans more Wesleyan than Wesley."

The aliment of heresy is well defined in the following strictures:—

"*T.* Have you, Mr. Guardezfoi, ever read 'Fletcher's Checks,' out of which Mr. D. has read us those extracts?

G. No: I never read Methodist books.

T. And have you, Mr. Democop, ever read Edwards' Works, out of which Mr. G. has been just reading to us?

D. No: I never read Calvinistic books.

T. There, now, is just what makes sectarianism and bigotry. And I may say to all sectarians in the words of Cicero, '*Vestra solum legitis; vestra amatis, caeteros, incognita causa, condemnatis.*' You read nothing but your own books, you love only what favors your own opinions; those who differ from you, you condemn without a hearing. Now the only step towards reconciling the different religious sects would be to reverse this absurd and uncandid practice, and every one to read on all disputed points what has been advanced on the opposite side from that which he has embraced. Political partizans may be pardoned, perhaps, for patronizing those papers which advocate the

principles of the party, and the blind devotees of the party may be pitied, if they read nothing from presses on the other side; because men's worldly interests are all that is concerned in the case: but what apology can be offered for those who follow the same miserable course in matters of religion—a thing into which worldly interests and party feelings ought never to enter? When men allow themselves to look at the opinions and persons of their fellow-Christians, of other denominations, through the distorted and discolored medium of the writings of their own heated and prejudiced controversialists, and refuse to read or hear any thing in their defence, they act as absurdly as would a jury who, after hearing the lawyers on behalf of the prosecution, should stop their ears, so as not to hear a syllable that might be said in vindication of the accused. What, in such a case, must be their verdict we all know. No wonder, then, that the sectarian bigot, who has, all his life, been listening to the representations respecting his Christian brethren and their opinions, as given by those who are either prejudiced or have an interest in misleading and deceiving him, or both together—for this is the honest truth as it respects all party leaders—no wonder, I say, if the bigot should, in these circumstances, continue to be a bigot still. Therefore, I would advise you, Democop, to borrow and attentively peruse the works of Edwards; and you, Guardezfoi, do the same with Fletchers' Checks. You will, no doubt, each of you, be, in this case, at least as willing to lend as to borrow; and if Edwards should not convert Democop to Calvinism, nor Fletcher turn Guardezfoi to Arminianism, I am certain you will both be benefitted, if in no other respect than this, that you will have your prejudices softened, and your charity for those who differ from you in opinion promoted. But you must make use of candor while you read, otherwise it might have the contrary effect; for prejudice turns every thing into acid. It is by 'proving all things' that we learn to distinguish what is 'good,' and are strengthened, besides, to 'hold it fast' by a firmer gripe.

G. Were I to read every thing on controverted subjects in religion I should dread the consequence: I might be 'carried away by every wind of doctrine.' I believe I shall not touch Fletcher. 'Touch not, taste not, handle not,' is my rule in such cases.

T. Pardon me, sir, if I say that your sectarian bigotry feeds on scripture perverted and misapplied. This is one of its most horrid propensities. Consult your Bible, and you will see, from the context, that the precept you have quoted has no relation whatever to such a case as reading Fletchers' Checks.

G. Fletcher was an Arminian, and so was Wesley. Arminius was a heretic. It is dangerous to read the works of heretics.

T. How do you know whether Fletcher was a heretic? You never read him. Is not this prejudice? Be a man. Rise above such narrow views They are contemptible. Will you allow others to lead you where they please, blindfold? Wont you use your own eyes? Your own thinking faculties? If you love the truth as it is in Jesus, there is no danger of your being carried about by every wind of doctrine. The conflicting blasts of opposite opinions will only cause your faith to strike its roots the deeper; provided, indeed, you have faith. But if you love the truth, not as it is in Jesus, but as it is in the creed—no

matter what creed—your faith is only opinion, and as for that matter, it makes not a straw's difference what you are, whether Arminian, Calvinist, or what."

EVIL TENDENCY OF SECTARIANISM.

As to the evils of heresy, or sects, they are well defined. Sectarianism, first, prevents the spread of Christianity at home; second, the spread of Christianity abroad; third; it corrupts the first principles of religion in the heart; fourth, it produces a distorted character, a "tight creed and loose morals:—"

"The Pharisees of old, at the very time when they were about accomplishing the most atrocious murder that ever was committed, would not go with the crowd into the judgment hall, lest they might unconsciously contract some ceremonial defilement, which would unfit them for keeping the passover. The Mussulman feels no remorse from plundering and slaughtering a caravan; though his conscience would not rest, had he omitted his prayers and prostrations. When men place undue stress on those opinions and forms which distinguish them from other sects,—and all sects do this,—it cannot fail to produce that distortion of character which has been noticed, or some other not less deformed."

The following on the *personal* character of religion happily comes in here:—

"Any one who will attentively read the New Testament, and those facts of the Old that are most intimately connected with the New, cannot fail to observe how emphatically these sacred oracles make religion to be a personal thing, a concern in which each man has to think, feel, judge, and act for himself. And the more we act upon this idea, the purer will be our religion. I speak not of its fruits. These, of course, are outward. They grow on our social relations. But the thing itself, the principle, is within. The kingdom of heaven is within you. The religion of sect is ever the reverse of this. It exists not in solitude. It is found in the mass, but abroad, bustling, agitating, and acted on by sympathy, interest, affection, imitation. So that, in the end, there is nothing personal or individual about it. It is the creature of public policy, or public excitement, and in public it lives. Ah! how different is the sectarian from the man: the man in the public eye, with his cloak of sanctity, or his formal dress of orthodoxy thoughtfully adjusted, and the man in the private walks of life, at his business, among his family and his neighbors! Jesus said to his disciples, 'Ye are the salt of the earth.' It is the personality of religion, if I may so express it—its life and power in the soul of the individual, that makes him a particle of the conservative. This it is, that gives to religion its antiseptic property. If the world is the mass to be salted, the salt must not be of the same nature as the mass.—Whoever would exert a good influence upon the world must be above it. He must not be subject to its powerful attraction. He must be spirit, not flesh. But of this, more in another place."

Fourth, sectarianism wrests the scriptures; fifth, sectarianism relaxes discipline in churches.

"Sectarianism tends to relax the discipline, and consequently to corrupt the morals of the church that cherishes it in another way. By dwelling constantly, as sectarians, especially sectarian teachers do, on their peculiarities, which, as has been already shown, are mostly matters of no importance whatever, these peculiarities are magnified; they take possession of people's minds, engross their public discourses and private conversation, till, at last, nothing else can be thought worthy of regard."

Sixth, sectarianism leads men astray in many respects—essentially in this, that it consecrates both men and principles, which have no sacred nor moral character.

REMEDY OF THE EVILS OF SECTARIANISM.

The following is as just as it is severe:—

G. Well, I think there is, so far, strength in your argument, that I shall consent to read hereafter both sides of controverted subjects.—Give me Fletcher's Checks, Democop, and take in exchange Edwards.

T. There is one step towards union. Spirit of Sect! thy days are numbered."

We have always published both sides, and therefore our readers are, of all others in the world, on the most direct route to exterminate sects, according to Mr. Wylie:—

"*D.* Tell us what is to be the next step.

T. It is simply this: to cease the vain attempt, so often repeated by theologists, to reduce the infinite into your systems. This has been a fruitful source of controversy and of division in the church. 'When we talk of God, who is infinite and incomprehensible, it is natural to run into notions and to use terms which it is impossible for us to reconcile. And in lower matters, that are more within our knowledge and comprehension, we shall not be able to keep ourselves clear of them. To say that a curve line, setting out from a point within a hair's breadth of a straight line, shall run towards that line as swift as thought, and yet never be able to touch it, seems contrary to common sense; and yet were it not clearly demonstrated in the conchoides of Archimedes, it could never be believed. Matter is infinitely divisible; and therefore a cubical inch of gold may be divided into an infinity of parts; and there can be no number greater than that which contains an infinity. Yet another cubical inch of gold may be infinitely divided also; and therefore, the parts of both cubes must be more numerous than the parts of one only. Here is a palpable contrariety of ideas, and a flat contradiction of terms. We are confounded and lost in the consideration of infinites; and surely, most of all, in the consideration of the *infinite of infinites.* We justly admire that saying of the philosopher, that *God is a being whose centre is every where, and circumference no where,* as one of the noblest and most exalted flights of human understanding; and yet not only the terms are absurd and contradictory, but the very ideas that constitute it, when considered attentively, are repugnant to one another. Space and duration are mysterious abysses, in which our thoughts are confounded with demonstrable propositions to all sense and reason flatly contradictory to one another.

Any two points of time, though ever so distant, are exactly in the middle of eternity. The remotest points of space that can be imagined or supposed, are each of them purely in the centre of infinite space." *Edwards.*

These only reach one element of the constitution of the sectary—viz. "bigotry of opinion;" the second, "worldly interest."

"*D.* Well, what is your remedy for the other part of the evil—or, as I believe you called it—the second element of sectarianism?

T. Caleric. More caloric.

D. Caloric! Have you forgot what we were talking about?

T. No. We were talking about those stupendous icebergs—those huge floating mountains of ice, which the adventurous navigator encounters in the polar seas, and between which his frail bark is in danger, every moment, of being crushed—was not this our subject?

D. The man's head is surely turned. We were talking of sects.

T. And what is a sect but an iceberg? Impart sufficient caloric to the frozen mass, and its particles, dissolved by the genial influence, would mingle and flow together, in kindly fellowship, with the kindred particles that make up the ocean. Impart sufficient love, the caloric of the moral world, to those cold hearts, which the spirit of the world has congealed into selfishness, and combined together for worldly purposes, and they would not—they could not remain compacted together by the frigid principle of elective affinity, by which one icy particle cleaves to another, but would melt and flow together, with all their brethren in the great family of God, assimilated to one another because assimilated to him:—'for God is love.' "

Church funds dowried orthodoxy:—

"*T.* Allow me, however, to ask, Have you not repeatedly declared to me, that you believed the object of the New School party in the Presbyterian church, for many years, te have been to get the ascendency in the Presbyterian church, that they might wield its funds and the influence connected with them?

G. Yes, and I still think this was their object; bnt the excinding act defeated them. Was it not so?

T. Whether it was so, or not, I am not concerned to know: this I, and all the world know, that there has been a struggle for *something*; and, in the struggle, a great deal of ill-feeling generated and a mighty disturbance made, and a vast injury done to the interests of true religion. And charity itself can hardly repel the suspicion, that a worldly ambition has had much to do in these agitations. The great law-suit is a strong proof of this. The history of the church, in past ages, both before and since the Reformation, leads to such a suspicion. 'Where the carcase is there the eagles will be gathered together.' Ambitious and worldly spirits love a dowried orthodoxy. Monied establishments have never failed to corrupt religion, by giving intensity to sectarianism. The establishment is looked to as the means of affording a living to the pious—orthodox—and the zealous partizan. Monachism was, at first, a pure institution. Men retired from the world, and submitted to poverty, in solitary seclusion from the pleasures of social life, with the honest but mistaken view of cultivating, to better advantage, habits of piety, and raising higher the flame of

devotional feeling. It was soon found convenient to mitigate the rigors of such a life by somewhat of the comforts of that world which they had renounced, sent to them by the kindness of friends whose society they had left. The next step was to reward such distinguished piety by more ample donations. It only remained to secure by law what was so freely and piously granted; and thus there at length grew up, all over Christendom, a multitude of monastic establishments, which the Holy Briarian Monster used, as so many hands, in making war upon Truth and Heaven.

To support such as are actually employed in rendering important and laborious services in the cause of religion, is one thing; and to lay up funds, in any form of permanent investment, is a very different thing. Even civil governments have long since abandoned this policy, having seen, from long experience, the bad effects of it. An accumulated hoard is, always, either an instrument of oppression in the hands of a domestic tyrant, or a lure to some foreign spoiler. It is wonderful how much slower to learn wisdom, in this matter, ecclesiastics have been, than statesmen; and that the administration of the affairs of the kingdom, which is not of this world, should embrace in it less of faith and more of carnal confidence, than that of governments entirely secular! No republican thinks of securing our liberties by means of pecuniary investment. It is only in matters of religion that we think so absurdly. To guard the orthodoxy and increase the power of our church, we, with infinite pains and trouble, make permanent investments—foundations they are sometimes called—and should 'the foundations be destroyed'—we anxiously exclaim, 'What will the *righteous* do!' "

The practice and patronage of the Christian morals:—

"Let principle, high, pure, Christian principle,—not passion, prejudice, policy, or interest, be, then, our guide; and let us live as under the inspection of that Eye, from whose heart-penetrating search there can be no concealment, and as amenable to that judgment bar before which all must be tried 'ACCORDING TO THEIR WORKS.' My heart bleeds when I think of the distractions that sect has produced: let me, therefore, beseech and intreat you,—and would that my voice could reach my Christian brethren throughout the world!—I would beseech and intreat them all to transfer some of that regard which hitherto they have given to those of their own sectarian name to those who belong to the great household of faith; though under a different denomination, and especially to place a little stress on what they and their party call orthodoxy—though venerable for antiquity and recommended by the strength of numbers—or, at all events, a little *more* stress on orthodoxy, a thing which, if the sacred scriptures contain a syllable of truth, will, better than the other—much better—(however it may be treated now)—pass the ordeal of the LAST BREAD DAY, and, in the meantime, would, if properly honored and regarded, banish, from among the churches of the reformation, the fiend of Sectarianism, with all that mighty train of evils which he draws after him.——— Amen: so let it be!"

I have but two exceptions to this book, (the Appendix I have not read,) and but one of these is of any practical importance. I will not

at this time state either of them. I have quoted freely to induce all to read a very convincing and useful exposition of those grand views which have, since the days of the "Christian Baptist," brought on myself and fellow-laborers so much of the *odium theologicum*. Upon the whole, I have not read a treatise, for many a day, more generally accordant with our own sentiments, or more worthy, as we judge, of the candid consideration of all conscientious Presbyterians.

A. C.

FAMILY CULTURE.

CONVERSATIONS AT THE CARLTON HOUSE.

No. VI.

Wednesday Evening.—Further Remarks on the Traditions of the Patriarchal Age.

Olympas. WHAT do you mean, William, by *tradition?*

William. Any thing handed down from our fathers.

Olympas. Our names, goods, chattels, and hereditaments are handed down to us from our fathers. Call you these traditions?

William. Only their opinions, views, and experience.

Olympas. The latter term includes all that we value in tradition. We need not the opinions nor the views of our forefathers half so much as we need their *experience.* Their experience is often of great importance to us, and should always be respected.

Reuben. Is tradition necessarily oral, or may it be both oral and written?

Olympas. It is both oral and written. Books that are truly useful are written traditions, or the narratives of human experience. Can any of you recite a passage in Paul's writings that demonstrates his views of tradition as being both oral and written.

Thomas Dilworth. To the Thessalonians Paul says, "Hold the traditions you have been taught, whether by word or our epistle." This would imply that traditions, in his esteem, were both oral and written.

Olympas. And how, Thomas, do you define *experience?*

Thomas. Experience is practical knowledge, or our acquaintance with things from an immediate contact with them. So, I think, our school-master defined the word. He used to say that every man's experience was his knowledge, and that no person knew any thing but by experience

Olympas. Human knowledge has, indeed, but two chapters—our own experience and the experience of others. Faith invests us with the latter, while memory furnishes the former. But true knowledge is all comprehended under the term *experience;* all else is theory, hypothesis, conjecture. Tradition, then, is most valuable, as it records the knowledge or experience of past generations. But, unfortunately, other ideas and things have been called *tradition*—the dogmas, opinions, and hypotheses of men. Jews and Christians have volumes of written and unwritten traditions, which have no real knowledge or experience in them; and because of the use they have made of these, the very term *tradition* has fallen into bad repute. The Jews with their *oral* law, or unwritten written law, and the Romanists with their written unwritten opinions and hypotheses, called *traditions*, have made faith in tradition a disreputable belief. Still, when properly interpreted, tradition is the record of human experience. It is history, verbal or written. The Bible is, for the most part, tradition; for it gives us the experience of many individuals, and the divine procedure with them: and saving faith itself is but the belief of the traditions found in the New Testament.

Reuben. Did you not say that "*saving* faith" was practically more than belief of testimony or the assent to tradition?

Olympas. True: but these traditions respect a *person*, not a *thing*. Now the belief of the traditions concerning that person, necessarily imply confidence in him; therefore, when we wish to simplify to the humblest capacity, we say, that saving faith is *trust in Jesus;* or believing on Jesus as our Saviour; or trusting in God, through him, as the only way to God—as the truth and the life. Every one who trusts in God, and rejoices in Jesus Christ, is a saved person.

Reuben. This is, then, the reason why the saints of the ancient scriptures are so frequently spoken of as trusting in God, and why they are described as 'they that trust in him.'

Olympas. But we must return to our lesson. Tradition, when properly defined, is, you will perceive, the most useful of all the sources of intelligence to man. The Bible is a volume of traditions; and they that add to it their own traditions as of equal authority, as far as in them lies, make the word of God of no practical value—they make it void by their traditions.

Thomas Dilworth. Is there any now-a-days, who, like the old Jews, make the word of God of non-effect by their traditions?

Olympas. The doctrine of the church of Rome, according to the Council of Trent, is, that "the truth and discipline of the catholic church are comprehended both in the ancient books, and in the tradi-

tions which have been received from the mouth of Jesus Christ himself, or of his Apostles, and which have been preserved and transmitted to us by an uninterrupted chain and succession."

Thomas. And what do Protestants say of tradition?

Olympas. That "the Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." This is safe doctrine, if Protestants would not give it up in practice.

But as all religious truth was in the first place a matter of oral tradition, it was kind to have it conveyed through few hands, and carefully written on the memory of those who were entrusted with it. This was accomplished in the best possible manner by the persons employed in keeping the oracles of God during the first ages of the world. It was stated at the close of our last lesson that all the experience of the human family was communicated to Abraham and Isaac by two persons—Methuselah and Shem. How old, Reuben, was Isaac when Shem died?

Reuben. Isaac was born in the year of the world 2108, and Shem died in the year of the world 2156, or five hundred years after the flood. Isaac was therefore in his 52d year when Shem died.

Olympas. You said, at our last lesson, that the history of two thousand years reached Shem through two persons. You assume that Methuselah saw and heard Adam two hundred and forty-three years; that Shem saw and heard Methuselah ninety-eight years; and that Isaac saw and heard Shem fifty-two years. We know they might have done so; and what was possible in such a case is the most natural event; because who, in the time of Methuselah, would not wish to have seen and heard the first man? Who of us would not travel across all Asia to see the first man, so late as the close of the 7th century from creation, and to have heard him tell the wondrous story of his most eventful life!

Adam, Noah, and Shem must have related their experience more frequently and with more minuteness, because so often interrogated, and so universally interesting, than ever did any other men. Hence its superlative accuracy and safe transmission to Moses. Every word was stereotyped. If Adam, after the year 400, related his experience before and since the Fall, only once for every year, he must have told it at least five hundred times. Surely, then, he must have remembered it well. This is true of Shem, who carried in his memory the records of the antediluvian ages, as well as of ten generations after the flood. But tell me, Reuben, when you say that all the knowledge,

that is, all the experience of two thousand years, must have reached Isaac through but two persons—Methuselah and Shem—do you mean these two only, or these two supported by other witnesses.

Reuben. I presume there were, for much of this time, innumerable concurring witnesses; but I mean in point of *descent*, it needed to pass but through two persons till it reached the ears of Abraham and Isaac.

Olympas. And through how many from Isaac to Moses?

Reuben. Isaac may have conversed several years with Levi, his grand son; for Isaac lived contemporary with Levi some fifty-three years

Olympas. How do you make that appear?

Reuben. Isaac was born in the year of Abraham 100, or in the year of the world 2108; Jacob was born in the year of Isaac 60; and Levi in the year of Jacob 67; that is, in the year of the world 2235. Now as Isaac lived 180 years, he died in the year 2288, which was the 53d of Levi.

Olympas. How old was Levi when his second son, Kohath, the grand-father of Moses, was born?

Reuben. I never could find that out from all my readings of the five books. I find, Exod. v., that Levi lived to be 137 years old, and Kohath 133, and Amram, Moses father, 137; but in what year of Levi Kohath was born I know not.

Olympas. It is inferred from various circumstances that he was born in the 100th year of Jacob and 33d of Levi. Being 30 years old when Jacob migrated to Egypt, he must have lived in Egypt 103 years, or within 30 years of the birth of Moses. This would leave but 30 years for Amram to occupy in communicating intelligence from Levi to his son Moses.

Olympas. Can you, Thomas, repeat the dates of the deaths from Abraham to the death of Moses?

Thomas. Abraham died in the year of the world 2183; Isaac, in 2288; Jacob, in 2315; Levi, in 2379; Kohath, in 2401; and, allowing Amram to be born in the 35th year of Kohath, he died in 2340, at which time Moses was about 8 years old. But it may have been several years later, as we have no very certain data from which to infer his age at the birth of Moses.

Olympas. It is, then, upon the whole evidence before us, plain—that Methuselah could have communicated to Shem; Shem, to Isaac; Isaac, to Levi; Levi, to Amram; and Amram, to Moses, the history of all things from the creation. Moses in the genealogy of historians, is, then, but the sixth from Adam. Adam, the first; Methuselah, the

second; Shem, the third; Isaac, the fourth; Amram, the fifth; Moses, the sixth. Between Adam and Moses there stand but four successive witnesses—sustained, indeed, by an innumerable multitude of concurring voices. When, then, you hear any persons cavil at the narrative of Moses on account of the unwritten traditions of preceding ages, or because of the number of hands through which these documents passed, remember that it may have passed through but *four persons* from Adam to Moses; and that from the frequency of the repetitions necessarily called for, all things must have been most accurately retained and delivered over to Moses, who, in addition to all this, had the guidance of the unerring Spirit of God.

Who, of all these oracles of the patriarchal ages, think you, William, was most illustrious?

William. Enoch, I suppose, because he was translated.

Olympas. We are now speaking of these six oracular historians.

William. Shem, I imagine, because he lived in two worlds and had conversed with the antediluvians and postdiluvians, and had more experience than any other man from Adam to Moses.

Olympas. Tell me, Susan, what does the word *Shem* mean?

Susan. You told us that it means RENOWN: you also said it means *King of Peace.*

Olympas. You mistake when you say that the name SHEM indicates any thing more than *renown.* When I spoke of the King of Peace it was in reference to the opinion that Shem and Melchisedeck are both names of the same person. Edward, can you sum up the reasons I gave for the opinion that Shem is the mediator called Melchisedeck.

Edward. You said that Shem was a personal name, and Melchisedeck an official name; that *malchi* denoted king, and *zedek* righteousness—"*king of righteousness;*" and that *Salem* corresponded to Jerusalem, the City of Peace; for *Shalam* imports *peace.*

Olympas. But this does not amount to a reason why we should identify *Shem* and *Melchisedeck*

Olympas. You said that the eldest and most illustrious branch of every family was priest; and of the family of Noah Shem was doubtless in the time of Abraham the most venerable and illustrious member. And in the second place you observed that Paul himself held up to admiration the superlative dignity of that person, even in comparison with Abraham, and showed that as Shem was the most renowned father of the Messiah, and of Abraham too, as their progenitor, it behooved that, if any one was to fill the high place of Universal Priest, especially in reference to the progenitors of our Lord, Shem should be that person.

Olympas. But we give that consideration more significance by the fact that Shem was, in point of age, experience, and personal dignity, the first man in the world. He was the oldest, most intelligent, and authoritative person, being then the head of *nine* generations. "Consider, says Paul, how great this man was, to whom even the patriarch Abraham gave tithes of all!" Again, it is certain that Shem was living at that time, and being the chief progenitor of our Lord, who could be High Priest over him! It would have been an infraction upon the patriarchal institution to have made a *son of Shem* High Priest over him. Ne person could, in compatibility with that institution, be High Priest over Shem. The words to Cain indicate this principle: "If thou doest well, shalt thou not have the excellency [over thy younger brother?] unto thee shall be his desire, and thou shalt rule over him." It was right that Abraham should have received the benediction from Father Shem, who lived at Jerusalem and was High Priest of the world. He, too, of all postdiluvian men, in respect to these high official honors, was without beginning of days or end of [priestly] life; without father and without mother, having no priestly ancestry, nor succession, but a Priest of his own order, officiating for a world during the interregnum from Noah to Abraham, and that too to the day of his death. He was, therefore, a most eminent type of the high priesthood of Jesus. But our speculation on Shem has led us a great way off from the strict subject of our morning's conversation; but our excuse is, that we shall find in the book of Genesis the seeds or elements of all the subsequent revelations, precepts, and promises vouchsafed to man. We must therefore note them as we proceed. Having now sketched the history of tradition, and the memorable events of the antediluvian world, we shall, at our next lesson, take up the history of the flood. A. C.

THE END OF THE PRESENT DISPENSATION IN 1840.

The writings and preachings of a certain Mr. Miller, of New England, on the coming of the Lord during the present year, have given rise to some discussion and excitement in that quarter. Already a new periodical, called "The Signs of the Times," edited by J. V. Himes, Boston, is instituted on that subject, and has advanced to its third number. We think it due to the community to record the fact; and as Mr. Miller has given us a brief summary of his views on the whole subject, we shall not abridge them. We give them to our readers rather as one of the *signs of the times*, than because we regard

them as scriptural or well-founded. The author of them is a little enthusiastic, perhaps; but be this as it may, we do not believe that his views are well founded, and yet they are more plausible than much of the most popular creeds of the last century. I have no objection that the present dispensation close during the present year. But were it to close, the fortunes of Christianity are vastly diverse from all that we have learned from both Testaments—especially from Daniel and John.

A. C.

From the Signs of the Times.

MR. MILLER'S VIEWS.

The following article, containing an abstract of Mr. Miller's views, has been prepared by him at the particular request of many of his friends. It will be published in Mr. Hayward's excellent work on "Religious Creeds and Statistics."

My dear brother—You have requested of me my views on religion and my peculiar sentiments wherein I may differ from the sect to which I belong, (Regular Baptist.)

As it respects the obligation of rational beings to God, their duty to obey, love, and worship him, I agree with them. As it respects our duty to our fellow-men, I believe we should agree in theory at least.

As it respects the character of man in his fallen state, I know not as we should disagree. I believe all men, coming to years of discretion, do, and will disobey God; and this is in some measure owing to corrupted nature by the sin of our parent. I believe God will not condemn us for any pollution in our father, but the soul that sinneth shall die. All pollution of which we may be partakers from the sins of our ancestors, in which we could have no agency, will, and can be washed away in the blood and sacrifice of Jesus Christ, without our agency. But all sins committed by us as rational, intelligent agents, can only be cleansed by the blood of Jesus Christ, through repentance and faith of the agent. I believe in the salvation of all men who receive the grace of God by repentance and faith in the mediation of Jesus Christ. I believe in the condemnation of all men who reject the gospel and mediation of Christ, and thereby lose the efficacy of the blood and righteousness of our Redeemer, as proffered to us in the gospel. I believe in practical godliness as commanded us in the scriptures, which is our only rule of faith and practice, and they only will be entitled to heaven and future blessedness who obey and keep the commandments of God as given us in the Bible, which is the word of God. I believe in God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is a spirit, omnipresent, omniscient, having all power, creator, preserver, and self-existent; being holy, just, and beneficent. I believe in Jesus Christ, the son of God, having a body in fashion and form like man, divine in his nature, human in his person, godlike in his character and power. He is a saviour for sinners, a priest to God, a mediator between God and man, and King in Zion. He will be all to his people, God with us forever. The spirit of the Most High is in him, the power of the Most High is given him, the people of the Most

High are purchased by him, the glory of the Most High shall be with him, and the kingdom of the Most High is his on earth.

I believe the Bible is the revealed will of God to man, and all therein is necessary to be understood by Christians in the several ages and circumstances to which they may refer; for instance, what may be understood to-day might not have been necessary to have been understood a thousand years ago: for its object is to reveal things new and old, that the man of God may be thoroughly furnished and perfected in every good word and work for the age in which he lives. I believe it is revealed in the best possible manner for all people in every age and under every circumstance to understand, and that it is to be understood as literal as it can be and make good sense, and that in every case where the language is figurative we must let the Bible explain its own figures. We are in no case allowed to speculate on the scriptures, and suppose things which are not clearly expressed; nor reject things which are plainly taught. I believe all of the prophecies are revealed for to try our faith, and to give us hope, without which we could have no reasonable hope. I believe that the scriptures do reveal unto us in plain language that Jesus Christ will appear again on this earth; that he will come in the glory of God, in the clouds of heaven, with all his saints and angels; that he will raise the dead bodies of all his saints who have slept, change the bodies of all that are alive on the earth that are his, and both of these living and raised saints will be caught up to meet the Lord in the air. There the saints will be judged and presented to the Father without spot or wrinkle. Then the gospel kingdom will be given up to God the Father. Then will the Father give the bride to the Son Jesus Christ, and when the marriage takes place the church will become the "New Jerusalem," "the beloved city." And while this is performing in the air, the earth will be cleansed by fire, the elements will melt with fervent heat, the works of man will be destroyed, the bodies of the wicked will be burned to ashes, the devil and all evil spirits, with the souls and spirits of those who have rejected the gospel, will be banished from the earth, shut up in the pit or place prepared for the devil and his angels, and will not be permitted to visit the earth again until a thousand years. This is the first resurrection and first judgment. Then Christ and his people will come down from the heavens, or middle air, and live with his saints on the new earth in a new heaven or dispensation forever, even forever and ever. This will be the restitution of the right owners to the earth.

Then will the promise of God to his Son be accomplished—"I will give him the heathen for his inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth for his possession." Then "the whole earth shall be full of his glory." And then will the holy people take possession of their joint heirship with Christ; and his promise be verified—"The meek shall inherit the earth," and the kingdom of God will have come, "and his will be done in earth as in heaven." After a thousand years shall have passed away, the saints will all be gathered and encamped in the beloved city. The sea, death and hell will give up their dead; they will rise up on the breadths of the earth out of the city, a great company like the sand of the sea shore. The devil will be let loose to go out and deceive this wicked host. He will tell them of a battle against the saints; the beloved city; he will gather them in the battle around

the camp of the saints. But there is no battle: the devil has deceived them. The saints will judge them, the justice of God will drive them from the earth into the lake of fire and brimstone, where they will be tormented day and night forever and ever. "This is the second death" After the second resurrection, second judgment, the righteous will then possess the earth forever.

I understand the judgment day will be a thousand years long. The righteous are raised and judged in the commencement of that day, and the wicked in the end of that day. I believe that the saints will be raised and judged about the year 1843. According to Moses' prophecy, Levit. xxvi, Ezek. xxxix, Daniel ii., vii., viii. to chapter xii., Hosea v. 1–3., Rev. the whole book, many other prophets have spoken of these things. Time will soon tell if I am right, and soon he that is righteous will be righteous still, and he that is filthy will be filthy still. I do most solemnly entreat mankind to make their peace with God, and be ready for these things. "The end of all things is at hand." I do ask my brethren in the gospel ministry to consider well what they say before they oppose these things. Say not in your hearts, "My Lord delayeth his coming" Let all do as they would wish they had if it does come, and none will say they have not done right if it does not come. I believe it will come; but if it should not come, then I will wait and look until it does come. Yet I must pray, "Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly."—This is a synopsisof my views I give it as a matter of faith. I know of no scripture to contradict any view given in the above sketch. Men's theories may oppose. The ancients believed in a temporal and personal reign of Christ on earth. The moderns believe in a temporal spiritual reign for a Millennium. Both views are wrong—both are too gross and carnal. I believe in a glorious immortal and personal reign of Jesus Christ with all his people on the purified earth forever. I believe the Millennium is between the two resurrections, and two judgments—the righteous and the wicked, the just and the unjust. I hope all the dear friends of Christ will lay by all prejudice, and look at and examine these three views by the only rule and standard—the BIBLE.

I remain, as ever, yours,

WM. MILLER.

Low Hampton, April 11, 1840.

MORALITY OF CHRISTIANS—*No. XX.*

"You must sell it," says the political economist: "you must sell it to some person." Why? "You will lose by it if you do not. It will die in your hands, or it will be of no service to you. It is a worthless concern Sell it.' Now what is the moral of this—so frequent and so familiar style? The spirit of the policy when revealed, is, 'You must cheat some person, or you will lose something.' And is this the morality of thousands who make the Christian profession? Who does

not know it? Can such enter the kingdom of heaven! "Verily, I say to you, unless your righteousness excel the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, you shall in no wise enter the kingdom of heaven." Yet they were not so gross in matters of this class as many of our mercenary and worldly professors of the present day.

The genius of the world is the spirit of selfishness; while that of the gospel is the spirit of benevolence. The former is centripetal—the latter, centrifugal. The one seeks its own good only in harmony with the good of mankind; while the other seeks its own advantage, not only regardless of the good of others, but often at the expense of their rights.

But the spirit of sectarianism is not the spirit of Christianity; nay, indeed, it is contrary to it. It goes for the party, and confines its charities and its benevolence to the little circle of its own speculative peculiarities. Moral and Christian excellence is not the circumference of the circle of partizan views and affections. The last thing in the world for which the champion of sectarian orthodoxy contends are the moral virtues and excellencies of the Christian character. I have not yet found the history of that sect whose distinguishing badge is Christian morality. On the banner of no creed, on the escutcheon of no party are inscribed Piety and Moral Righteousness as the only terms of Christian fellowship and co-operation.

Sectarism is decidedly immoral in all its tendencies, and inimical to the genuine piety of the gospel. Hence the general disregard of morality and the low standard by which its merits are rated in this community. The veracity, punctuality, ingenuousness, and moral honesty, without which, in ancient times, a man's religion was altogether vain, are often, now-a-days, among the dispensables in the behaviour of a professor. A Christian's word, his Yea or his Nay, was once as good as his bond and as sacred as his oath. His representation of a subject was as conformable to fact as the image of a man is to his person in a molten mirror. Guileless simplicity and unaffected candor were once the invariable adjuncts of a Christian profession, and the man of the world was distinguished from the Christian as much for the want of these attributes, as for his vernacular and provincial superstition. Reformation always ends short of its pretensions and promises, if it goes not to the end of the chapter of every moral virtue.

Our Lord, the greatest and best reformer, fixed for his disciples the moral perfections of the Divine Father as the ultimatum of his doctrine and precepts. His sermon on the Mount is not only altogether practical, but wholly engrossed with the maxims of piety and humanity. He

makes moral righteousness the Alpha and the Omega of this admirable discourse to which all the world assents, but which so few practise. A man's destiny forever, with him, turns upon his doing or not doing the will of the heavenly Father as developed in his precepts and moral lessons.

The impossibility of serving God and Mammon, when resolved into its proper elements, consists as much in the maxims by which they are severally obeyed, as in the diverse and rival objects proposed to their respective votaries. We cannot have the approbation of Mammon, as his good and faithful servants, unless we industriously carry out into practice all the maxims of selfishness, duplicity, double meanings, and circumvention with which the reformed code of this popular demon abounds. Industry, economy, and frugality, without the arts of taking advantage of the times—(that is, the people and their circumstances)—without a large capital of the policies of the trade and the refined hypocrisies of fair dealing will be in vain relied on for distinguished success in courting the smiles of the god of wealth.

The nice delicate refinements of conscientious benevolence, the sympathies of our nature, and those honorable feelings which threw so much dignity and amiability around our nature, must not be indulged. We must harden ourselves for the conflict of conscience, feeling, and selfishness, and subordinate all to the supremacy of the demon of covetousness and personal aggrandizement. A man can ordinarily rise to a respectable eminence amongst the favorites of Mammon, but at the sacrifice of his moral feelings, conscience, and religious character. The principles, maxims, and prudential code of the kingdom of heaven, and of our best worldly and political kingdoms, are generally antipodal in their spirit and tendency, if not in their letter and forms; and, therefore, the impossibility of being a distinguished servant of both at the same time.

The passion for wealth is a strong passion. It is not to be restrained by the nice points of moral propriety. It leaps over the feeble barriers which sectarianism throws in its way, and in its paroxysms transcends all laws human and divine. It will hazard the frown of God and eternal ruin, rather than give up the struggle for renown amongst rival claimants for high honors in the temple of the golden idol. Hence the maxims, *You must sell it;* and You must buy it at the expense of the rights and interests of another.

The Christian Lawgiver says, 'Look not on your own wealth, but also on that of one another' The man who obeys this principle in our religion, will never seek to advance his fortune one dollar, by invading the rights of another to the value of one cent; while he who

looks to his own interest only, must invariably equivocate, suppress, discolor, exaggerate, undervalue, or some way impose first upon the understanding, and finally upon the pocket of his neighbor.

Most of the coldness and bad times, many of the controversies and cases of discipline which occur in churches, arise from this foredoomed and soul-withering passion for wealth: for in truth "the love of money is the *root of all evil*, which, while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows." But "thou, O man of God, flee these things!"

So long, however, as Christians pay an undue court to men of wealth, without regard to moral worth; and despise the poor, without regard to their vices and follies, so long will men be at unrighteous pains to secure that which secures to them more than all virtue and goodness can secure. The court paid to wealth by Christian professors is one of the most luxuriant causes of that effort to obtain it, even among professors, which has in its bold career degraded Christian morals, disdained the restraints of Christ, transgressed the laws of God, and filled the Christian church with hypocrites, pretenders, and worldlings, who, with the world in their heart, and heaven on their tongue, have brought the profession down to a level with the inoperative speculations and idle dreams of the Pagan theorists of other times. From such professors may the Lord speedily deliver his church!

A. C.

A VOICE FROM THE NORTH ON CHRISTIANOS.

A Voice from the North has in it much good sense; but I have two reasons for not committing it to print. The first is, we have had every idea in it uttered from the East, and from the West, and from the South, by thunders, voices, and echoes, until all who wish to understand what is excellent in it do understand it; and to those who will not understand it a thousand volumes would be an offering of no value. In the second place, the part that most impinges Christianos is as fully admitted by him as by the Voice, &c. He makes a change of *state*, as well as a change of *character*, essential to a Christian; but he contends that the state is changed, *so far as the heart is concerned*, anterior to, and independent of, any act of obedience to any positive precept whatever; and should any particular precept never be obeyed, either because of a physical impossibility or through a simple mistake of its meaning, that such a person would ultimately be saved,

although in this life he should never fully understand nor enjoy the Christian religion; and such a person he calls a Christian because of his Christian profession and Christian character, and because his heart is reconciled to God through Jesus Christ. Now I think the difference between Christianos and these different voices might be divided and adjusted by the change of a single word. If Christianos had contended that there were *disciples* of Christ among the sects, instead of Christians, he would have stood on a rock and been approved by all that have censured him.

The disciples of Christ, it is true, were called Christians at Antioch; but at the time they received this cognomen they were far advanced from what they had been some years before. The phrase "disciples of Christ" scripturally included all his followers from the beginning of his ministry to the fourteenth year after its close—even down to the days of Paul and Barnabas, whom some imagine (without due consideration of the original) to have been the authors of the name Christian.* Now although the term *disciples* of Christ and the term *Christian* were equivalents at Antioch, A. D. 48, they could not have been so A. D. 34. The former is, therefore, of more scriptural latitude than the latter. Hence while all Christians were disciples of Christ, all disciples were not Christians in the sense of Acts xii. 26. Now amongst the sects there are many disciples of Christ; but, perhaps, very few to whom the name Christian would rightfully apply in the exact latitude of its meaning at the time of its first application.

Still we must all acknowledge that there is a use of the term *Christian* now current—and, indeed, the popular use, which justifies CHRISTIANOS with the whole community, if not with the apostolic scriptures. That is the appropriated sense of a true and real follower of Jesus in spirit and in truth. Thus we hear all professors say, 'Such a one is a Christian'—not a Presbyterian, Methodist, or Episcopalian only, but a *Christian*. A Christian, with them, is more than a sectary, however orthodox and zealous he may be. No matter what a man calls himself, the people generally will never, in the popular use of the word now-a-days, call any man a Christian who is not eminently a follower of the example of Jesus Christ.

Christians at Antioch were persons who had arrived at a firm persuasion of all the Christian facts concerning the death, burial, resurrection, ascension, and glorification of Messiah, who had been immersed into that belief, and who obeyed the Lord according to the apostolic precepts and examples. No one, then, can be called a Christian, in the Antiochan sense, who does not resemble them in

* At a proper time and place we shall give our reasons and authority for this conclusion.

knowledge, faith, and manners, though he may be scripturally called a disciple of Christ.

Our brother of the Voice will please be more concise, or less diffuse, and come up more directly to the precise point at issue when next he writes for the Harbinger, and meet the point exactly in the sense of its defender. A. C.

[CIRCULAR.]

To the Disciples called Christians, in the State of Indiana..

BELLVILLE *Hendricks county, Ia., September* 7, 1839

Beloved brethren—From the Report which was made to the General Meeting at Indianapolis in the month of June last, it appears that we then numbered over seven thousand, and probably not less than ten thousand members in this state. But we have no paper to record our history, to tell who are our public men, to advocate our principles, or to meet the calumnies with which the cause of reformation and of the restoration of primitive Christianity, to which we are attached, is often assailed. Such a paper, by some of us, has long been considered a desideratum. We want a weekly or semi monthly sheet, to be issued from some central point, which shall be taken by every congregation, and by members of every congregation in the state. But *how* to begin, and *how* to sustain it, have been the questions.——Several brethren, having had correspondence on this subject, met at Bellville on the 7th of September, A D 1839, after due consultation and deliberation, have concluded to submit to you the following:—

"Whereas another general meeting has been invited and agreed upon, to convene at Crawfordsville, on Friday before the 2d Lord's day of June next, at which it is expected there will be a full attendance, we would respectfully and earnestly request that each and every congregation in the state will take this subject into consideration and act upon it, and, by letter, and by the faithful brethren who may attend said meeting, make known what are the sentiments of all; that if it shall then appear that such a paper as we propose for Indiana can be sustained, an editor may be selected, and the other arrangements necessary made, for commencing the publication."

By order and in behalf of the Meeting,

JOHN O'KANE, *Chairman.*

F. W. EMMONS, *Secretary.*

News from the Churches.

Georgetown, Kentucky, April 29, 1840.

I returned yesterday, through the rain, from Antioch, where we had a meeting with brethren Gano and Scott, of seven days. We had a most joyous time of it; for we obtained twenty-one additions to the good cause which we plead—ancient Christianity. The meeting was rather interrupted by rain and planting corn. Had it been a leisure time, I believe we should have gained one hundred additions. We spent about two days at Union on my return towards home, and we obtained two more additions. A very hard rain brought this last meeting to a close sooner than we anticipated.

I am much gratified at your remarks in the Harbinger of this month in reference to revivals. A protracted meeting to present the truth, and thus convert the people, is indispensable; but the revivals of the sects, which are carried on by a blast, pulling and hallooing the people to the mourning bench, &c. and all the machinery that is calculated merely to alarm, result in absolute evil, and will finally become a fruitful source of infidelity. When I see so much nonsense in such practices, I feel the more disposed to make, if possible, *greater* efforts for the advancement of truth. J. T. JOHNSON.

Somerset, Pa., April 21, 1840.

Brother Bosworth has fully met the expectation of the brethren here. He is a sound *practical* man, full of knowledge, zeal, and the love of the gospel. He has added twenty-five by immersion to this and the neighboring churches of this county—has excited much attention and investigation, which we doubt not will result in much good. In short, any community must be blessed with the labors of so excellent a brother. But more than all this, it gives me much pleasure to add, that the church in this place is increasing in the faith, order, and practice of the gospel, the maintenance of which will do much toward the promotion of the good cause in this country. May the Lord prosper still more extensively his own cause throughout the world! W. H. POSTLETHWATE.

Adams county, Illinois, March 25, 1840.

Since my last communication to you I have had the pleasure of immersing about twenty persons upon a profession of their faith in Christ, most of whom are living in Warren county—some in Knox. Truth is gaining in this region; but we lack laborers. It can with truth be said now, as anciently, "The harvest truly is great, but the laborers are few May the Lord of the harvest send forth more laborers, who may gather fruit unto life eternal." LIVY HATCHILL.

Nottingham, Harrison county, Ohio. April 17, 1840

I am happy to inform you that the churches in this vicinity are doing well. I have attended the Morristown church regularly for several months past, and have succeeded in restoring complete harmony in its proceedings. *Eleven* have obeyed the King as the fruits of our labors, and the prospects are brightening. My congregations are crowded and attentive. The Washington church has continued to increase up to the present time Seven were received a few days since, and added to the saved: it now numbers eighty-four, and prospects cheering. The society are engaged in completing their new chapel, 30 by 40 feet, frame. I labor half the time for, and with them, in the ministry of reconciliation. ROBERT COOK.

Charlestown, Indiana, April 15, 1840.

Brother Jacob Wright informed me that he immersed twenty persons in Brownstown and its neighborhood, Jackson county, Ind., in the latter part of February and first of March. M. COLE.

Little Rock, Arkansas, March 10. 1840.

On yesterday I immersed three persons in the Arkansas river. Within about six months I have immersed some twelve or fifteen persons. We progress slowly. We number at present some forty five. Several have joined by letter lately. A brother of good talents and approved prudence could do much good here.

We have been imposed upon by travelling brethren (or those who would be.) It is of the last importance that brethren travelling should take letters. Our practice is one that would do much good and prevent much evil—which is to give to our brethren, if they only travel a short distance, a letter of commendation.

Few churches have met with more opposition than this one has from all parties, though at the present our prospects are quite good. W. W. STEVENSON.

Jackson, Louisiana, March 9, 1840.

We have nothing of interest to communicate. On the 17th of January we returned from Georgia. At Athens I preached by invitation twice in the Baptist church, and once in the Methodist In the former I showed the error of confounding piety with sonship; the fundamental import of the latter term being citizenship, and piety an incidental idea in the Christian use of the term. This led me to the very root of sectarian error. When I had concluded one of the most faithful discourses I ever delivered, the Pastor of the church prayed the Lord to bless the *truths* which they had heard!!! On Next Lord's day, in the same house, I discoursed on the distinction which Paul draws in the 8th of Hebrews between the two Covenants, and especially dwelt on the fact, that a perfect remission of sins was a prominent distinction, being a constitutional privilege of citizens in the Messiah's earthly kingdom—that being a constitutional privilege of citizens, it appertained to none but citizens—and to all of these it did of necessity appertain from the first moment of citizenship—i. e. so soon as they believed and were immersed, but not before. This, too, seemed to be well received both by Baptists and Methodists Some of the most intelligent of the latter class told me afterwards they believed every word I had advanced.

In the Methodist house I dwelt on the twofold character of Christ, and the blessings to be derived from him (not through faith *alone*, but) through the obedience of faith, beginning in baptism, and going on to perfection. Although none obeyed, I hope good has been done. Intelligent and liberal minds professed to be delighted, even among the sects, and some Regular Baptists went so far as to say they had that day heard more real preaching in five minutes than they had heard from the same (the Baptist) pulpit in all their previous lives.

In Augusta I was not so fortunate, being deprived of the use of the Baptist house by the bigotry of one man, a deacon, whom I formerly baptized, and who was once ready to have plucked out his eyes and have given them to me, when I had made less progress in the knowledge of Christianity. It is a grievous sin now-a-days to know more of Christianity than one's neighbors.* I met with the little band at sister Tubman's, and had a most refreshing time in the breaking of bread, &c. Sister T. has determined to build a house for the Lord and his people. The Lord strengthen her in her purpose, and bless her in its execution!

Here, by a *new arrangement* relative to the Preparatory Department, we are deprived of the use of the Chapel, and have to meet at my house. This completely interferes with our congregation, the very thing desired by the sects. We need a house exceedingly, but are unable to build one. Would it be right to seek the aid of aliens in this matter?

* I would accept from a friendly alien a contribution for a meeting-house, but would not ask it. Paul accepted favors of a similar character from persons from whom he would not have asked them.—A. C.

It is obvious that men cannot believe without hearing, and that they will not, with few exceptions, come to a private house for that purpose. If we had a comfortable house, I have no doubt we would have a liberal share of the church-going folks, notwithstanding all the efforts which the sects might make to the contrary.

I have written this scrawl in such haste I am afraid you will hardly be able to read it. In that event you must do with it as I had to do with yours written from Montgomery, Ala.—viz. apply to the writer for assistance. JAMES SHANNON.

Aurora, Ohio, April 14, 1840.

We read that under the ministration of the Apostles "the word of God grew and was multiplied;" we ought to be thankful and rejoice that we live to see the same in our days. The brethren in these counties appear much alive to the propagation of the gospel. It is the opinion of the brethren that these regions never presented better prospects for the success of the labors of evangelists than they do at this time. About thirty have been immersed in churches not far distant within a short time. A meeting of days is in progress in this place, attended by brothers Collins, Clapp, and Green. Ten have already joined, and prospects encouraging.

Brother Campbell, do you remember the old man my father? He is no more He fell asleep in the Lord on Sunday the 29th of last month He had full confidence in the Lord, and met death with calmness and joy He had been thirty-eight years a member of the church of God. May the God of all consolation support his aged partner, and guide his children in the paths of peace! A. S. HAYDEN.

Father Hayden was one of the first advocates of reformation in the bounds of the Mahoning Association. He was a regular attendant at our minister meetings held in the Mahoning region some eighteen years ago, when all the principles of reformation were debated and thoroughly canvassed by the Baptist ministers of that day; all of whom, with one or two exceptions, in 1823 and 1824 declared themselves on the side of reform. Here the seeds of reformation were extensively sown at an early day, and a large harvest has since been gathered. Father Hayden, besides giving us two sons whose labors in the word and teaching, as evangelists, are extensively known and highly appreciated, gave, by his influence and example, an impulse to the ball of reformation in the days of our comparative weakness and inexperience.* Happy the dead who have finished their earthly toils, and rest in the world of glorious realities and rewards!

A. C.

Lexington, Kentucky, May 7, 1840.

I have just returned from Nashville, Tennessee, where I preached every evening and a few mornings for two weeks. The result was the addition of twenty-six persons to the congregation of Christ in that city. We had a good hearing all the time, and scores of others were serious and appeared to be almost persuaded to become Christians The brethren there were made joyful by your promise to visit them this season They desire to know when they may expect you. B. F. HALL.

Enoch, Monroe county, Ohio, April 3, 1840.

Our mode of procedure has been as follows.—We met together frequently at my house, being six in number, including my wife, daughter, and myself, and attended to the breaking of bread, prayer, and exhortation, and invited our neighbors to witness our order. At length one of the most intelligent of the Methodist females came forward and said she was convinced she must be buried with her Lord, and several others followed and acknowledged the gospel. I immediately went 20 miles and obtained three proclaimers—brethren Timothy Bates, Mordecai Harper, and John Frame, to hold a two days' meeting with us. We are now organized into a congregation of 20 members, and meet every first day to break bread and exhort one another, and to teach others also.—We have chosen brother William Kelsoe for our bishop. We respectfully solicit our preaching brethren to visit us. JOHN UDELL.

Louisville, Kentucky, March 23, 1840.

We immersed four here last week, and have two more to bury on to-morrow evening. Two miles above us five or six were immersed by brother Short, at Middletown, on yesterday. Brother Ashton, of Albany, Indiana, has just returned from Mobile. He immersed three in the neighborhood, and formed a church of seventeen persons GEORGE W. ELLY.

* To save myself from the respectful and generous castigation of a very affectionate brother, I would explain what I mean by joining, aiding, or assisting us in the cause of reformation. I do not mean helping us *personally*; but 'helping the Lord,' 'helping the truth,' 'forwarding the mission of the Apostles,' by taking part with us in a cause to which we had at that time been for some years devoted. I meant no more than this in some sayings which have recently been severely handled by a contemporary editor.

A. C.

Todd county, Kentucky, March 9, 1840.

Near to Elkton, our county seat, forty have been baptized since the first of December last. From the first of October up to that time, at other places, eleven

HENRY T. ANDERSON.

April 14, 1840.

On last Lord's day I was in Fulton, where there were five additions. The first Lord's day brother Wills and myself had an interesting meeting in this county: three were immersed, and two others made the good confession, who will submit soon to the same command. The first of next month I expect to set out on a preaching tour of several weeks in the counties of Pettis, La Fayette, Jackson, &c.

T. M. ALLEN.

Chester, Ohio, March 28, 1840.

We have appointed a yearly co-operation meeting here, to commence in the month of September, on Saturday preceding the 2d Lord's day. I feel a great interest in having you attend this meeting for other reasons than those already mentioned. Please let me hear from you, if it will be possible for you to give us a visit at that time.* The good cause progresses here slowly. I have immersed some eight or nine during the past year, some of them the most influential persons in the county. Brother Ashley, of Portsmouth, is going to travel in this and the adjoining counties this year. I hope, with the blessing of our heavenly Father, that we shall be able to do much good in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.

JAMES E. GASTON.

Bloomington, Illinois, May 5, 1840.

Last October a congregation of disciples was organized here, with fifteen members. They have continued to meet every first day to commemorate the death and sufferings and the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. At a protracted meeting since, we had an addition of eight by confession and immersion, principally under the labors of brother Robert Foster, of Sangamon county, and a few from other churches, previously immersed; so that our present number is about thirty. Brother T. Major is Elder, and brethren E. Platte and M. Scott are Deacons. We are living in peace, and the prospect we think tolerably good for more accessions to the cause of Bible religion, though much opposed by the Methodists, the popular church in this place. The Methodist Elder residing here takes the liberty of assailing the 'Campbellites,' as he is pleased to call us, wherever he goes; and sometime since took great pains (not far from where brother Foster lives) to speak against the 'C——ite' views of faith, repentance, and baptism for remission of sins, and called on the advocates to defend such views. Brother Foster not being present, or any other of the brethren that felt competent, the challenge passed unnoticed till brother Foster made a visit to this place. He immediately informed the Elder by letter that he was ready to defend said doctrine. The gentleman declined discussing the subject, saying there was no issue on that subject; that he had preached faith, repentance, and baptism for remission of sins, and could prove it by our Elder. This concession was made in presence of a large congregation who were called on to notice the confession. He, the Methodist Elder, then drew up ten propositions, and required of brother Foster direct answers to them, in order to join issue, as he pretended, that a discussion might take place on 'the prominent doctrines of C——ism.' But the propositions were evidently designed to entrap brother Foster, as direct answers could not possibly be given to such questions without it. We are persuaded, however, that the investigation of the matter did good, as it was conducted before the eyes of the whole congregation, so that they were witnesses of the unfairness manifested by the Elder. The matter closed at last without investigation of the points at issue.

Brethren J. A. Linsey and H. D. Palmer are Evangelists this year in this and the adjoining counties. They are men of unexceptionable character, good speakers, and exemplary piety.

R. O. WARRINER.

New Lisbon, Ohio, March 27, 1840.

I think I stated in my last that our church was in good order, and that we had four or six additions a short time previous to writing; and as an evidence that we are still doing well I must inform you that we have had thirty one added by immersion, including those first named, and prospects are better now than at any time back. Brothers Henry and Lanphear held a meeting four days with us, and baptized ten of the above number about two weeks since, and were both much fatigued when they arrived, and had to close just in the commencement of the excitement. If they could have continued eight or ten days, there would have been a great deal done.†

BENJAMIN PRITCHARD.

Mantua, Ohio, March 4, 1840.

I anticipate much good will result to the great cause, from the accomplishment of your great enterprize of raising up a host of useful citizens to fill the various departments necessary to the development of the reformation. I wish you much success. I hope the brethren and friends of good order will co-operate with you.

* I am engaged for September, and cannot possibly be with those brethren, however much I could desire it.—A. C.

† I would rejoice could I have visited Lisbon at this time, according to the solicitation of many; but I cannot.—A. C.

On this subject I have time now only to say, that I hope a thought expressed in some of your essays on education will not be forgotten, the necessity of education being such as to enable the students in after life to depend with safety on their own resources.

The cause for which we plead is gaining influence in this place. We hope to lay the foundation for permanent usefulness. Much needs to be done to fill up the measure of Christianity. I can only say that I think we are improving.

I am glad you purpose to make the subject of church discipline understood. Permit me to present the following query.—The Apostle writes to the Corinthians (1st ep. chapter 5) of a common report of a crime among them not even named among the Gentiles, and directs that the person who *hath done* this deed should be delivered over to Satan. Who were the judges whether the accused person was guilty or not guilty?

DARWIN ATWATER.

From the Christian Publisher.

PROSPECTS IN VIRGINIA.

The good cause in Eastern Virginia has had to force its way through dangers and opposition within and without. The ablest pens in the state have been wielded against it; and although its opponents have long since learned that it was folly to oppose us frankly and openly by argument, still they have never ceased their opposition; but, changing their policy, have opposed us more effectually by private means, insinuations, and unfounded reports.

From these causes the truth has suffered much: still its heaviest stroke has been given it by its friends. The extravagant and speculative character that has so widely distinguished our labors, has had much to do in hindering its progress Experience is admitted to be a wholesome and wise instructor. We have learned long and painfully in its school. Unless we are stupid beyond all calculation, we should be able to steer clear in future of many evils which have heretofore resulted from our indiscretion.

Harshness of language, and a fondness for inoperative speculations, we now hope, will be avoided and deprecated by all the lovers of truth. Let the older brethren who have passed through the fiery ordeal of a painful experience, admonish the younger and rising disciples; and let youth and inexperience learn that age and experience are not to be despised.

In addition to the quietus that all distracting and blighting speculations have found in the cordial concurrence of the brethren; and in addition to the increased fund of useful experience which we have reaped from the past, we have the pleasure of beholding all the congregations in peace and harmony. We are not aware that a single difficulty now distracts any church in Eastern Virginia.

The congregation in Richmond, which has suffered more sorely than any other, is in perfect harmony, and presents to the eye every appearance of soundness and health. The faction that at one time existed there, has ceased to exist; and nearly all who, under the excitement and influences of the moment, had left the congregation, have returned to its government and worship, sick of every thing at war with love and good works. We lately held a meeting with the church, and judging from the numbers who attended preaching, we should suppose their hearing to be vastly better than it has been for years. Brother Henshall, whose agency has had much to do with the restoration of order and confidence, labors for the church as an Evangelist; and we cannot but sanguinely calculate upon permanent and extensive good's being done by his prudent and lucid exhibition of truth ¶

The only difficulty of any magnitude that seems to oppose the spread of truth, is the scarcity of active and efficient laborers. We have but very few in the state whose whole time and talents are devoted to the work To remedy this deficiency is a desideratum of great importance. Let the wisdom of the churches look to it They should encourage young men of talents and opportunity, who are disciples, to *preach the word*. The sowers of the good seed must be greatly increased before we can reap a plentiful harvest. The churches should also diligently see that all their Evangelists, who are devoted to the work, are *fully sustained*. It is not enough to promise them a support—it must be cordially and fully bestowed. There is a vast difference between a support in promise, and a support indeed—between a support on paper, and a support on the table. Promises, pledges, assurances, &c. do very well for awhile; but something beyond these are necessary to feed, warm, and clothe a family An Evangelist, perplexed by the uncertainty attending the support which his family must have, is in a poor condition to labor freely and efficiently in the field. *Let the church see to this!* It is the duty of her officers—let them learn to be awake to their duty!

WINANS ON THE NAME.

Jamestown, Ohio, March 25, 1840.

I am in the practice of putting down things as they occur to me. I had occasion to examine the word Christ to ascertain what it was to believe in Jesus as the Christ, and found that it was a Greek word which translated the Hebrew word Messiah, and when rendered into English was *Anointed*. Then, said I, if the disciples were named Christians first at Antioch, and were so called every where else afterwards, is that a good

reason why that name should obtain in all languages? May not that name be transmitted as well as the name Messiah, from the Hebrew; into Christ in the Greek, or into Anointed in the English. If in Greek the disciples were called Christians, why not call them Anointians in English or Messians in the Hebrew? Shall we make a hobby of a Greek name, and build a sect upon it? I prefer the name Christian in English as long as the word Christ is retained; but if that word be translated into English, then his disciples should wear his name in English also. M. WINANS.

RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE.

CINCINNATI, *Ohio*, April 17, 1840.

Deur brother Campbell—

ALTHOUGH personally unacquainted with you, I feel no reluctance whatever in addressing you a letter, as we are both members of the same great family.

I have been recently brought into the kingdom of the Messiah; and as my case may serve to illustrate, in some degree, the power of truth, it may not be uninteresting to relate it.

I was born of Presbyterian parents—*sprinkled* (baptized?) in early infancy by the *Rev. James M'Chord*, and brought up under the pastoral teaching of the *Rev. John M'Farland*, of Paris, Ky. Fifteen years ago I was taught to say, "Our Father who art in heaven," &c. &c. "deliver us from Alexander Campbell, Barton W. Stone, the Devil, and all his wicked followers."

At the age of 13 I was sent to Miami University, where I received for near four years religious instruction under the eye of President, Bishop, and Professor M'Guffey, now President of Athens College in this state.

Before leaving home for College I was brought into the communion of the Presbyterian church, (I think at the age of 9,) under the discipline of the "New Divinity."

A collegiate life, however, soon dissipated all religious impression, and by the time I left the institution I had no relish for Christianity in any shape or form in which I had seen it presented.

For about four years subsequent to this period I was engaged in the study of medicine. After receiving my degree I spent some time in this city, where I heard your addresses before the College of Teachers and your discussion with Bishop Purcell. Until this time, sir, I thought it was a sin against heaven to go inside of a "Campbellite church;" such was the force of early prejudices. Shortly after this I returned to my native state, (Kentucky,) and located in Georgetown, where I became acquainted with Elders John T. Johnson, D. S. Burnet, and others, with whom I had a number of conversations on the subject of the reformation. My mind was constantly perplexed with the doctrines of the Trinity, Regeneration, Imputed Sin, Total Depravity, Baptism, &c.

I attended the "C———lite church" often—became somewhat serious, but I was afraid to confess the Saviour, apprehending that the Holy Spirit had not yet, "dove-like, sat brooding" on my heart, "and made it pregnant" with the love of God.

I became an earnest inquirer after the truth. I determined to investigate for myself the claims of this "new religion" to authenticity; and for this purpose I took up one of the best theological works with which I am acquainted—*the Bible*. I endeavored to lay aside my

prejudices, and all the undue influence which had previously operated upon me by strong sectarian adhesiveness. You will not be surprized when I tell you that this was a hard task. I read the Bible, both the Old and the New Testament. I was well convinced of their authenticity. I could plainly discover the correlative character of the two books—that one proved the authenticity of the other—that the Man, Christ Jesus, was the Messiah promised to Abraham. I could see the splendor and the beauty, the grandeur of the scheme of atonement—a scheme worthy alone of the conception of a God. I could see that pardon, redemption, and regeneration could only be effected by coming to Christ. I felt inclined to accept the offer of salvation held out by the gospel; but, oh! the power of habit—the power of early associations—the power that is sent forth and exerted upon the tender mind by sectarian wisdom! I was afraid I might not be one of the elect, and that it would probably be best to wait until the Holy Spirit would baptize me with the emotions of God. I left Georgetown and went wandering in "the far West." For some time my serious impressions remained, but they were eventually dissipated by witnessing the contentions, the animosity, the backbitings among those who called themselves the followers of the meek and lowly Jesus. I asked myself, "Is this Christianity?" The church of Christ is one—one great family—and the brethren and sisters of this family certainly must love to dwell together in unity. "Where, then, is the church catholic?" Thus I reasoned. I finally came to the conclusion that I would attach myself to no denomination of Christians, yet allowed myself to hope for a resurrection from the dead with the saints made perfect, and the enjoyment of everlasting life.

Shortly after this period I returned to Kentucky—to Georgetown. Again I heard the gospel preached, and again I became interested in the subject of religion. I acknowledged to one of the brethren that if a crisis ever were to arrive when the grand division of Christian and Infidel should be called for, I would unhesitatingly step on the side of the Christian; but still I had not courage enough to come out and make the good confession.

My mind was greatly troubled. Philosophy pointed me to a God; Nature pointed me to a God; the Bible to a God and to his son Jesus Christ. And these same great sources informed me that man was an immortal being—that death was not (in the language of the French infidels) '*an eternal sleep*"—that I was an accountable being—that as God had the omnipotence to create a world and all that is therein—he could by his omnipotence destroy the same at one word—that Heaven recognized only two classes—the *good* and the *bad;* the children of God and the children of the Devil. I soon saw that there was no middle ground, and that, as a rational being, I was bound to become a Christian. I looked around me, and I heard the cry, "I am of Paul, I of Apollos, and I of Cephas." What could I do? I simply asked the question. Who is of Christ? In such a condition of mind I returned to Cincinnati, where I witnessed the power of the truth—where I heard the same good news to which I had been listening only for three years. I believed, repented, confessed, and obeyed, and am now rejoicing in the hope set before me in the gospel.

W. J. BARBEE.

EARLY PIETY.

THE following dialogue between a mother and her daughter, in her 9th year, of my intimate acquaintance, was faithfully detailed to me not long since. Thinking that it may be of some value as an incentive to parents to discharge their parental duties, I present it with my kindest regards to all Christian mothers. A. C.

Mrs. M. What do you want to be baptized for?

L. That I may have my sins forgiven me.

M. Can you not have your sins now forgiven you without being baptized?

L. No, I cannot.

M. Why not?

L. Because Christ has promised that if I repent and be baptized he will forgive my sins; but I know that if I do no more than be baptized, baptism would not save me. I must do every thing that he has commanded us.

M. Do you think that you could do every thing he has commanded us?

L. I think that I could: for Christ says, "My yoke is easy, and my burthen is light;" and I think this means he will give me easy things to do

M. What has he told children to do?

L. To obey their parents in all things: for this is well pleasing to the Lord.

M. Do you think that you understand the scriptures enough to be baptized?

L. I think that I understand the same that the Eunuch did. You know that when Philip and the Eunuch were going along the road they came to some water, and the Eunuch said to Philip, "See here is water—what doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said to the Eunuch, If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest. And he said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." And he baptized him. Then he went on his journey rejoicing. Now I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God; that he came down from heaven to this world, and died for us that we might be saved; and I think when people rise up out of the water, and know that their sins are all forgiven them, they must be very happy.

M. But should you sin after you are immersed, how then would your sins be forgiven?

L. If we repent and cry to the Lord, he will then forgive us.

M. Would he not forgive you without being immersed, if you repent and cry to him?

L. No, he would not; because we must obey Christ's commands: and it is not our parents or any other person that we have to obey in being baptized—but Jesus Christ. And when I am baptized I must put away childish things—I must put off the old man with his deeds.

M. What do you mean by putting off the old man with his deeds?

L. I mean to put away anger, wrath, malice, lying, and every bad practice, and to put on the new man who is renewed after the image

of him that created him—to put on humbleness of mind, meekness, long-suffering, forgiving one another; and to put on love which is the bond of perfection; and to let the peace of God reign in our hearts; and to teach and admonish one another in psalms, hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in our hearts to the Lord.

Now, mother, may I be baptized against next Sunday. If I do not understand the scriptures well enough, I want you to teach them to me. I am sure that you can have time enough against next Sunday; for I want to have my sins forgiven me, for I think that Christians can go to bed so happy when they know that their sins are forgiven them.

She was baptized on the next Lord's day, along with three others of her acquaintance. She arose out of the water with the most serene and joyful countenance, and truly went on her way rejoicing. On retiring to rest that evening she said to some of her associates, "Surely Satan must be sorry to-night, having lost four of us to-day!"

THE EVANGELIST.

I EXCEEDINGLY regret certain indications of a spirit which, from explanations, apologies, and assurances, given on the part of the *Evangelist*, on its own pages and transferred to ours, I hoped never again to see; inasmuch as I and the brethren had the *promise* of its editor that we should "*never be wounded again by the publication of any thing of a similar nature in the Evangelist;*" and not only this promise, but a "*pledge from his hand* that the like shall not obtain again." See M. H., vol. iv., p. 187.

Now if not of "a similar nature" with the imputations and insinuations of former articles, I ask of what nature is the following attempt ty elicit from my remarks on "Heretical Publications" a violation of the ninth commandment, in the words following?—"It matters not how, or by what words or management, a writer associates in the public mind, or in the minds of my brethren, my person, periodical, words, or sentiments with heresy, if there be nothing in them of the nature of heresy, he is intentionally or unintentionally guilty of a breach of the ninth commandment." Now I will only say, that there is not one word of the kind in the article referred to, as any one may see who will only read it with care. The piece was addressed to contributors for periodicals, and not to editors directly; and was written on the occasion of a brother editor in the West kindly sending me a communication against my views, with the query, '*What would you think of me should I publish such a communication?*' or words to that effect. I thought the contributor was about to make the periodical heretical if he could, and accordingly wrote the few remarks captioned "Heretical Periodicals." Now by what authority the *Evangelist* could say that "it had pleased certain to take both the words and the sentiment from his November number of 1839, and to place them under such a caption," I conjecture not. One thing is certain—he has no authority from me, for he is not named nor alluded to in the piece!

But to use his own words, "It matters not how, or by what words

or management a writer associates in the public mind, or in the minds of my brethren, my person, periodical, words, or sentiments" with a violation of the ninth command; he may call me a "*beloved brother*," but surely he cannot love nor esteem me as he ought. But to save himself, if not me, he adds, "We, however, lay in no charge of this nature in the present instance." Can any brother, then, inform me why associate my name, words, or management with a violation of the ninth command!!

After this unfortunate display of 'a similar nature' with former times, I am next castigated for using the words, "The numerous periodicals that have from time to time risen to assist us"—as if they had not risen to the help of the Lord. Every one knows, and the *Evangelist* himself as well as any man in the world, that I alluded to the fact that the *Christian Baptist* led the way in the present effort at reformation. Well, as charity has, from being blind to a multitude of sins, become so eagle-eyed as to find a thousand faults where there is but the similitude of one, I must, I suppose, ascribe this to the spirit o the age, rather than to one who often calls me a "beloved brother."

But an "*anonymous publication*" appeared in the Harbinger, criminating, *as some imagined*, the Evangelist. That, however, having been printed while I was from home, and before the letters of explanation above alluded to were written, even in the judgment of the Evangelist, as now expressed, attaches no blame to me.

I believe all the premises are now before my readers, from which originated these new indications of the spirit of the December number for 1838. The allusions to that number in the last Evangelist, page 81, I cannot but regard as not only uncalled for, but, when considered in all their circumstances, as incompatible with professions recently made and pledges solemnly given, especially as the Evangelist very well knows that I do regard that number as *false in some of its prominent facts, and unchristian in spirit, matter, and form*, notwithstanding all the explanations and avowals of sincerity and good intentions which he has from time to time reiterated. I impugn the motives of no brother; but facts with me *are facts*, and what I know *I know*, and an angel could not make me believe that white is *black*, or black *white*.

If the Evangelist desires peace, he has mistaken the path. I have been silent when I ought to have spoken, rather than occasion a word of discord. I seek peace and love above all things. But peace has a price; and I will suffer no man calling me "a beloved brother," to associate my name, sayings, or doings, with such a course of conduct as is imagined and imputed in the article before me, without remonstrating against it and calling for reformation.

The cause we plead, and a proper degree of self-respect, alike forbid such tameness as would silently endure such behaviour from any brother—especially from one whom I have delighted to honor. If I have in a single word misunderstood the Evangelist, I shall willingly be corrected; but I want more than professions, and I will not hypocritically say Peace, peace, when there is no peace; and when a fault is once acknowledged, I expect that the acknowledgment is not immediately to be repented of and retracted. I hope I shall not soon again be called upon to notice such a public and open violation of Christian courtesy and decorum; and I need not add, that it will afford me the

sincerest pleasure to forgive these injuries done to my character and feelings on the first indication of true repentance. As many as love peace and seek it, peace be on them and mercy, and on all the Israel of God! A. C.

SELF-MADE MEN.

You may take the whole population of any State in this Union, and select from it the fifty men who are most distinguished for talents or any description of public usefulness, and I will answer for it, they are all, every one of them, men who began the world without a dollar. Look into the public councils and who are they that take the lead there? They are men who made their fortunes—self-made men, who began with nothing. The rule is universal. It pervades our courts, State and Federal, from the highest to the lowest. It is true of all the professions. It is so now, as it has been so at all times since I have known the public men of the state or the nations: it will be so while our present institutions continue. You must throw a man upon his own resources to bring him out. The struggle which is to result in eminence is too arduous, and must be continued too long to be encountered and maintained voluntarily, or unless as a matter of life and death. He who has fortune to fall back upon, will slacken from his efforts and finally retire from the competition. With me it is a question whether it is desirable that a parent should be able to leave his son any property at all.—*Falconer.*

A HEAVY CHARGE.

A WRITER in the last number of the Journal of the American Temperance Union makes the following specific charges against alcohol. He asserts that it occasions—

1. Three-fourths of the crime in the State of New York.
2. Seven-eighths of the pauperism.
3. Three-fourths of the taxation.
4. One-third of deaths of adult males.
5. Nearly half of the diseases.
7. From twenty to thirty thousand drunkards.
7. Loss of twelve years, on the average, from each drunkard's life.
8. The destruction of millions of property, annually, in one way and another.

But there is a great amount of evil produced by alcohol which is not usually referred to this source. A very great part of the listlessness, indifference, inattention to family affairs, loss of time, want of enterprize and energy, and general delinquency which are noticed among the poorer classes, and which are spoken of only as natural failings or moral defects, are doubtless the result of *drinking;* and this, too, in many cases in which a character for intemperance is never acquired.—*North American.*

The following, from the pen of a brother in Philadelphia, is worthy of a place on our page, and of the perusal of our readers.—A. C.

A REFLECTION.

THE reign of '39 is past, and all
Its woe and weal, with years beyond the flood
Are now commingled. Hastening down the stream
Of time, we mortals rapidly approach

That bourne, the unobserved, yet certain home
Of all that live, and move, and breathe on earth.
And yet how unconcerned, unconscious,
And unwise do men appear! The lessons
Of the past, unheeded monitors! like
Unwelcome visiters, are soon forgotten;
And the bustling cares of life—the wild desire
For wealth—the ardent, eager thirst for fame—
The maddening rage of party politics—
And the more bitter feuds of angry sects,
Engross the noble faculties which God
Has given to man.

Endued with wisdom
To devise the proper means to carry out
The purpose of his being, in acts of
Christian virtue and benevolence—
MAN, Creation's constituted lord, should
Be the guardian of this lower sphere, the
Bright resemblance of that glorious ONE,
Whose every look was *love:* whose godlike voice
Spoke peace, and joy, and health wherever heard.
His meek and humble advent has just been
Celebrated. But, oh! how few of those
Who bowed the knee, can say without reserve,
"As I *would* that men should do to me,
So *do* I unto them." The angry look,
The persecuting zeal of lawless bigots,
Found in Church, Convention, and Assembly,
The frauds of politicians to circumvent
Their fellows; the boisterous strife that rings
Through legislative halls; and all the rage
For speculation, with which the times abound,
Leading to murder, suicides, and ruin,
Give proof, most painful proof that all the show
Of outward pomp and grandeur thrown around
The Christian name in gorgeous temples,
Are but as tinsel robes which barely hide
The vice, the peculation, and the crimes
That lurk beneath. Sad is the mournful sketch
We here have drawn! but not more sad than true.

And shall we know no change from scenes like these?
Yes; 'tis written by the unerring pen
Of Inspiration, that all the evils
With which man is cursed shall cease! That gentle
Peace shall stretch abroad her radiant sceptre,
And disperse those clouds of earth-born sorrow
Which send through widows' breasts the pang of woe,
And cause the orphan's tear to fall; that man
His fellow-man no more shall vex by fraud,
By rapine, or by death. Those halcyon years
Shall know no discord. "Swords into ploughshares,
Spears into pruning hooks shall change their use,
And men learn war no more." "The Prince of Peace
Shall reign: the government upon him rest;"
While joys, increasing joys, shall know no end.

When shall the vision come? For some do say,
"Where is the promise of his coming?" Where!
Within this bright decade of time: *commenced*
TO-DAY. The swift-winged moments as they fly
Shall bring the sound so long desired—the sound
Of Gabriel's trump! Make preparation
For your Lord's approach! With heaven's glory
He shall come! *His* nation waits to make him room;
Restored to Judea's hallowed soil, they'll
See him come, and shout him "Blessed of the Lord!"
May we be waiting, and prepared to hail
That hour—by Faith, and Love, and cheering Hope,
With deeds of Charity combined—prepared;
Nor let this "note of time" unheeded pass.

1st month, 1st, 1849.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

NEW SERIES.

VOLUME IV.——NUMBER VII.

BETHANY, VA. *JULY*, 1840.

ATONEMENT—*No. II.*

In my first essay on sin-offerings I stated that the Christian world were divided on the design, end, or purpose of them. The overwhelming majority of Christians have placed their whole effect on God, on his law and justice, and on his government;—on God, to reconcile and propitiate him to sinners—on his law and justice, to satisfy their penal demands against them, in the person of their substitute on his government, to make it honored and respected in the universe.

Others, while they acknowledge these to be the designs of sin-offerings, yet do not confine their effects on God, his law, and government, but also acknowledge that they are designed to produce a moral effect on man, as to reconcile him to God, to purge and cleanse him from sin.

In my first number I said that I could not believe that sin-offerings were ever designed to produce such effects on God, his law, justice, or government, because it was not so declared in the Bible, and I cannot believe any thing as unerring divine truth but what I find there: if sin-offerings are designed to produce these effects, and this doctrine is taught in the Bible, why do not the advocates of it plainly refer us to the book, chapter and verse where it is taught. Let them not substitute vain philosophy, far-fetched inferences, and the wisdom of words for the doctrine of God.

I do not wish to be understood as denying that such effects are produced on God, his law, and government by sin-offerings, but that I cannot believe them for want of divine evidence; and I might add, because this doctrine seems to me plainly to contradict many things taught in the Bible, and to be condemned by matters of fact. But of these hereafter.

I will now endeavor to state my own views of sin-offerings, their end, and design. I agree with all Christians that the great design of sin-offerings is to make an atonement. Though the sin-offering itself may be called the atonement, yet it is so called because it is the means of effecting an atonement or reconciliation. More than thirty-seven years ago I defined atonement to be *at-one-ment*, or reconciliation. The authorities then adduced, it is believed, have never been seriously impugned, nor denied. Not long since I have seen the same definition given by high authority, as Calmet's Dictionary, enlarged and edited by Robinson, Theological Professor at Andover. On the word they say—

"We have evidently lost the true import of this word, by our present manner of pronouncing it. When it was customary to pronounce the word *one* as *own* (as in the time of our translators) then the word *atonement* was resolvable into its parts, *at-one-ment*, or the means of being *at-one*, i. e. reconciled, united, combined in fellowship. This seems to be precisely its idea, Rom. v. 11—Being (to God) reconciled, or *at-one-ed*, we shall be saved by his (Christ's) life, by whom we have received the *at-one-ment*, or means of reconciliation. Here it appears the word atonement does not mean a ransom, price, or purchase paid to the receiver, but a restoration of accord, which is, perhaps, the most correct idea we can affix to the term expiation, or atonement, under the Mosaic law." See also J. Brown's Dic. Bib. on the word.

In order that we may see clearly the application of this definition of atonement, I will introduce a few propositions from the "Address" long since published.

1st. There did exist, and does exist, and will forever exist a close and intimate union between God and all holy beings.

2d. There did exist a close political union under the law between God and Israel, while Israel continued politically holy and ceremonially clean.

3d. Nothing but sin and uncleanness ever broke this moral or political union between God and his creatures. "Your iniquities have separated between you and your God." Isai. lix. 2.

4th. Whatever removes the saparation between God and his creatures, restores the union between them.

5th. The blood of beasts, slain in sacrifice under the law, removed the political or ceremonial separation between God and Israel, and restored the union between them.

6th. The blood of Christ under the New Testament removes the moral separation between God and believers, and restores the union between them.

7th. God's holy nature cannot be in union with man's unholy nature. 2 Cor. vi. 14, 16. But when man is cleansed and washed from sin by the blood of Christ, then, and not till then, are God and man united, reconciled, or *at-one-ed.*

8. The *at-one-ment*, reconciliation, or union between God and his creatures, either under the law or under the gospel, never took place before the person or thing defiled was cleansed or purged by the blood of a sin-offering.

9. There is an awful separation between God and the fallen world. Man's sin and wickedness is the cause. God is holy, just, and good—man is unholy, unjust, and wicked;—God is light—mankind is darkness. How can natures so discordant be united? Either God must change into the temper and spirit of man, or man must change into the temper and spirit of God. The first is impossible; therefore man must be changed or lost from God forever. To effect this very end was the Son of God sent by the Father of mercy, who lived, died, and rose again for our justification. His very ministry was that of reconciliation, (or *at-one-ment;*) "for God was in, or by, Christ reconciling (at-one-ing) the world unto himself"—"God hath reconciled (at-one-ed) all things unto himself by Jesus Christ"—"We are reconciled (at-one-ed) unto God by the death of his Son."

From the remarks it will be seen that the primary design of the blood of sin-offerings, both under the Old and the New Testament, is, to purge or cleanse from sin and defilement, whether moral, political, or ceremonial; and the proximate effect is *at-one-ment.*

The Apostle Paul says, "Almost all things are by the law purged with blood." Heb. ix. 22. Let us inquire what those things were which were purged with blood, how they were purged, and what was the effect of this purging.

1. The altar was one of the things purged with blood. Ezek. xliii. 18–26. "And he said unto me, These are the ordinances of the altar—thou shalt take of the blood thereof (a young bullock) and put it on the four horns thereof (the altar) and on the four corners of the settle, and upon the borders round about. Thus shalt thou *cleanse* and *purge* it; and on the second day thou shalt offer a kid of the goats, without blemish, for a sin-offering; and they shall *cleanse* the altar as they did *cleanse* it with the bullock. When thou hast made an end of *cleansing* it, seven days shalt thou *purge* the altar, and *purify* it." Moses describes the same thing in nearly the same language, Lev. xvi. 18–20. "And he shall go out unto the altar, and make an *atonement* for it, and shall take of the blood of the bullock, and of the goat, and put it on the horns of the altar round about, and *cleanse* it, and hallow it from the

uncleanness of the children of Israel. And when he hath made an end of reconciling the altar,' &c.

Dr. J. Taylor, in his Hebrew Concordance, says, "The word atonement is always in the Old Testament, rendered from some tense, or noun derived from the root *kaphar*; nor is there any Hebrew word we translate *atonement*, but what comes from that root"

Now with respect to the case of purging the altar, we have remarked that Moses and Ezekiel were describing the same thing in nearly the same words. The altar was defiled by the uncleanness of the children of Israel. It must be cleased or purged. How? Ezekiel says, "Thus (by the blood of a bullock) shalt thou cleanse and purge (*kaphar*) it." Moses says, "He shall make an *atonement* (*kaphar*) for it." Again Ezekiel says, "Seven days shall they *purge* (*kaphar*) the altar." Moses says, "Seven days shalt thou make an *atonement* (*kaphar*) for the altar." Exodus xxix. 37. Again, Ezekiel says, "When thou hast made an end of *cleansing* it (the altar.") Moses says, "When thou hast made an end of *reconciling* (*kaphar*) the altar." The effect, then, of this blood was to cleanse, to hallow, to sanctify, and to make the altar most holy; or in the language of Paul, it was to purge the altar. As this effect is described by *kaphar*, frequently translated *to make atonement*, and *to reconcile*, we conclude that *to make atonement*, *to reconcile*, and *to purge*, are synonymous, all expressed by, or translated from, the same word *kaphar*.

The word *kaphar*, it is believed, is as frequently translated *to purge* or *cleanse*, as *to make atonement*. Let the attentive reader turn to the following texts, and where he finds *cleanse* or *purge* in those texts, they are so translated from the Hebrew *kaphar*. Num. xxv. 33; 1 Sam. iii. 16; Psalm lxv. 3, and lxxxix, 9; Prov. xvi. 6; Isai. vi. 7, and xxii. 14, and xxvii. 9, and the texts quoted above.

Would it not be better always to translate the verb *kaphar*, when connected with sin, as the New Testament writers have done, by the Greek word *airo*, with its compounds, which is rendered *to purge*, *to cleanse*, *to take away sin;* than by translating it *to make atonement*, or *to reconcile?*

2. Another thing cleansed with blood is a leprous house. Lev. xiv. 52, 53. "And he shall cleanse the house with the blood of the bird; but he shall let go the living bird, and *make an atonement* (*kaphar*) for the house; and it shall be clean." How much more intelligibly would it read, 'And *purge* the house, and it shall be *clean?*' as the Psalmist, li. 7, "*Purge* me with hyssop, and I shall be *clean*."

3. The tabernacle of the congregation, the holy place, as well as the altar, were cleansed in the same manner. Lev. xvi. 16, 19, 20.

"And he shall *make an atonement* (*kaphar*) for the holy place; so shall he do for the tabernacle of the congregation."—"And when he hath made an end of *reconciling* (*kaphar*) the holy place, the tabernacle of the congregation, and the altar."—"Thou shalt take a young bullock without blemish, and cleanse the sanctuary. And the priest shall take of the sin-offering, and put it upon the posts of the house: so shall ye *reconcile* (*kaphar*) the house." How preferable would be the translation of these texts, to substitute the word *purge*, instead of *to make an atonement*, or to reconcile. This is Paul's rendering.

Let the reader examine the following texts, and all doubt will be removed. When he reads in these texts, *to make atonement*, *to reconcile*, the Hebrew word is *kaphar*. Lev. vi. 30, and xvi. 27, and viii. 15; Ezek. xl. 15, 17, 20; Dan. ix. 24; Lev. xii. 7, 8, and xv. 15, 30, and xvi. 30; Num. viii. 21; Lev. ix. 7; Lev. xiv. 19, 20, 21, 29, 31.

4. In these texts it will be seen that the people were also cleansed from their sins and uncleanness by their offerings for sin. Forgiveness always accompanies atonement, or purging, if it be not the same thing. Lev. iv. 20. "And the priest shall make an *atonement* (*kaphar*) for them, and it *shall be forgiven* them." See also Lev. iv. 26, 31, 35, and v. 10, 13, 16, 18, and xix. 22; Num. xv. 25, 28. So intimately connected are purging and remission, that they are often expressed by the same word *kaphar*. 2 Chron. xxx. 18, 19. "The good Lord *pardon* (*kaphar*) every one of them—though he be not cleansed according to the purification of the sanctuary." See also Psalm lxxviii. 38; Jer. xviii. 23; Deut. xxi. 8. "Be *merciful* (*kaphar*,) O Lord, unto thy people—And the blood *shall be forgiven* (*kaphar*) them." Deut. xxxii. 43. "He will be *merciful* (*kaphar*) unto his land and people." To be merciful unto, means to forgive. Heb. viii. 12, and x. 18.

Thus have I shown the design of the sin-offering under the law, to be, *purging* or *cleansing* from sin and uncleanness. When the person or thing is thus purged by the Lord through the means of sacrifice, then is God, his law, and government pleased, or reconciled with the person or thing thus cleansed, without any change in himself, his law, or government, because they were always pleased and satisfied with purity. The whole change has taken place in the person defiled Now the *at-one-ment*, or reconciliation, is effected between God and man.

In my next number I will write an essay upon the sin-offering of Christ, our great High Priest.

B. W. STONE.

LETTER II.—*To. B. W. STONE.*

BROTHER STONE:

My dear Sir—YOUR second epistle, dated April 10th, one week after the first, treats of the *design* of sacrifices. Sacrifice could, as a matter of course, reach no farther than the sins for which it was offered. If offered only for one class of sins, it could only in its design reach that class. Much, then, depends on forming a correct estimate of the sins for which it was offered. I showed, as I conceive, in my last, that sins of ignorance and legal uncleanness were not the only sins expiated or purified by the Jewish sacrifices; that all the sins of the whole nation of Israel—all their iniquities and transgressions, were annually taken away by sacrifice.

In your first letter you stated that the design of the legal sacrifices was "not to deliver from death, but to purify and cleanse the offerer." Do you think that there was legal sanctification without legal salvation in the ancient sacrifices? 'A man's sins might be forgiven through sacrifice, provided they deserved not death; but if they merited death there was no sacrifice for them!' Have you not thought, my dear sir, that this looks somewhat like the Romanist classification of sins into venal and mortal. The venal only were pardoned through sacrifice! The mortal were beyond the saving power of the law. Sins of ignorance, therefore, must be considered in the light of venal offences—not as moral guilt. Lev. v. 17. declares that "if a soul sin and commit any of those things which are forbidden to be done by the commandment of the Lord, though he knew it not, yet is he guilty, and shall bear his iniquity." Follows it not, then, that if any of the things forbidden in the commandments of the Lord incurred death, though done ignorantly, the appointed sacrifice obtained forgiveness or release from that penalty? Even in the case of Job's friends, before the law was given, sacrifice saved from the wrath of God. The Lord said to Eliphaz, "My wrath is kindled against thee and thy two friends: therefore, take unto you now seven bullocks and seven rams, and go to my servant Job, and offer up for yourselves a burnt-offering, and my servant Job will pray for you: for him will I accept, lest I deal with you after your folly." They did as commanded, and escaped.

In the case of one only legally polluted by the contact of a dead person, presuming to come into the congregation, death was to be inflicted; but if he had the ashes of the red heifer mingled with water sprinkled upon him, he might, without danger of death, enter the congregation at the time appointed. A still stronger proof that there was

atonement in the law saving men from temporal death, is found in Numbers xvi. 48. "And the Lord spake to Moses, saying, Get you up from this congregation that I may consume them in a moment; and they fell upon their faces. And Moses said to Aaron, Take a censer and put fire in it from the altar, and put on incense, and go quickly and make an atonement for them; for there is wrath gone out from the Lord: the plague is begun. And they made an atonement for the people, and he stood between the dead and the living, and the plague was stayed." The sequel may show the importance I attach to establishing the fact that the atonements of the law did save men from the penalties of that law, even from death, excepting in the single case of a presumptuous violation of the covenant or renunciation of it. And under the Christian economy the sacrifice of Christ extends not as an atonement to any that despise or renounce Christ.

But the Divine explanation of the reason why the Most High commanded *blood* to be used upon the altar, appears to my mind to banish all ambiguity both from the style of the Mosaic institute and from the Christian mind on the whole subject of atonement as taught both in the law and gospel. Sin is the forfeiture of life; or, what is the same thing, divinely expressed, "death is the wages of sin"—"the soul that sins must die." Now, says God, "I have given you *blood* upon my altar to make an atonement for your souls; because THE LIFE is in the blood"—for your life I accept blood, which is the life of the victim. I accept its life *instead* of yours. To quote his own words—"For the life of the flesh is in the blood: and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls: FOR IT IS THE BLOOD THAT MAKES AN ATONEMENT FOR THE SOUL." Again he adds, "Blood is the life of all flesh; the blood of it is for the life of it." Levit. xvii. 11–14.

If I understand your second letter, you and I agree that atonement is but the means of reconciliation; that atonement is the *cause*, and reconciliation the *effect*, though you are not so clear upon the subject as I could wish; but, perhaps, on a fuller explanation of the subject, w may perfectly harmonize on this great topic. I, like you, have all my life, divided the word *atonement* into three syllables—*at-one-ment*. But I do not on that account exactly understand you when you make it mean simply *reconciliation*. *At-one-ment* is the making, or that which makes at one, those who were not one; and *reconciliation* is *made one*. Figuratively we often put the *effect* for the cause, and the *cause* for the effect; but when we discuss a subject for the sake of understanding it we come to the literal and leave the figurative. Therefore the atonement and the reconciliation are just as different as

the two Greek words *hilasmos* and *katallagee*—the former means atonement as the cause, and the latter means reconciliation as the effect. While I readily own that either reconciliation or atonement may by a metonymy of the effect for the cause, or of the cause for the effect, be used indiscriminately, originally, literally, and properly, atonement (*hilasmos*) is that which *makes* one, and reconciliation (*katallagee*) is *made one*. The one is the cause—the other the effect. If this be doubted, we have a superabundance of evidence to offer. I shall, however, suggest only one fact at present, viz.—*that things that cannot be reconciled are said to be atoned*—such as the tabernacle, the altar, and their furniture. These are susceptible of atonement, but not of reconciliation, in the legal and proper sense of these words, as any one may see by examining only the book of Leviticus, particularly the 16th chapter.

Purification or expiation is also an effect of atonement, as well as reconciliation. In this sense atonement was made for the altar, the sanctuary, and almost all things are by the law purified by blood.

Propitiation or pacification is also an *effect* of atonement. So we find it applied to God, Ezek. xvi. 53. "When I am *propitiated* (*exhilaskesthai*,* common version, *pacified*) to you for all that you have done, saith the Lord." So prayed the publican—"God be *propitious* to me a sinner." Hence we find the *hilasmos* twice in the first epistle of John applied to Christ's blood—*the propitiation for our sins* Messiah, as foretold by Daniel, will make *propitiation* for iniquity.

Do I misconceive my brother Stone when I interpret his views of atonement as excluding the idea of propitiating or pacifying our heavenly Father? I know that he repudiates the idea of effecting a change in God—of changing him from an enemy to a friend. So do I. But still I say God *repents*, is *propitiated*, and *pacified*, and even *reconciled* to us. But the effects of sacrifice, or atonement, so far as the propitiating of God is contemplated, is more appositely set forth in the Bible than in any other book in the world, in the memorable effect of Noah's sacrifice upon God himself. Let us, Father Stone, turn over and read it:—"And Noah builded an altar unto the Lord, and took of every clean beast and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt-offerings on the altar. And the Lord *smelled a sweet savor;* and the Lord said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake." "*The Lord smelled a sweet savor*" not before, but while he sacrificed. Such was the effect of Noah's (the temporal saviour) sacrifice on God. And, in the same style, that learned He-

* I have quoted from the *Septuagint;* but, by opening your Hebrew Bible, you will find it in your favorite *kaphar*.

brew, our Apostle, has spoken of our Saviour. "Christ," says he, "has given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for a *sweet smelling savor*." This is what I mean by propitiating God. This *sweet smelling savor* is to God. It is a sweet and pleasing odor to him, on account of which he can be propitious to us. When then, you, brother Stone, ask me what I mean by sacrifice atoning or propitiating God, I refer you to the effect produced on him by Noah's sacrifice, by Christ's sacrifice—appositely, though pleonastically, expressed hy Paul, "for a sweet smelling savor." Christ's sacrifice Godward, and not manward, was then for a sweet smelling savor—pleasing, propitiating, reconciling God to man.

With all your precision and caution, brother Stone, on this subject, I find you come to my conclusions in my very words: for at the close of your second epistle you say, "*Then* is God, his law, and government pleased or reconciled with the person or thing thus cleansed." You then place yourself under the reprobation of your own censure when you ask me, letter first, "Do, brother Campbell, point us to the scriptures that say that sacrifices, either under the Old or New Testament, were ever designed to propitiate God, or that such an effect was ever produced or effected on him." After this you add, that you think I "have advanced a few steps farther than any other system-maker." Well, I am glad to be in such good company as that of brother Stone, who concludes with me—*then*, and not till then, of course—"*then* is God, his law, and government pleased or reconciled with the person," &c. &c.

You were, my dear sir, driven into *hypercriticism*—to being righteous overmuch at the time you wrote your address, by the violence of men of that hard-mouthed age which refused bit, and bridle, and curb; you were driven, if not past Jerusalem, a little beyond the beautiful gate of the Temple. You had men of strong prejudices, and not much biblical science, to contend with; and who were determined to drive with a wooden wedge and mallet the barbarous scholastic jargon of old Nicence trinitarianism down your throat; and, therefore, I do not wonder at your conscientious fastidiousness concerning terms and phrases which they may have misapplied. I have felt a good deal of your embarrassment, and know experimentally many of your difficulties. I appreciate fully your critical display of the use of *kaphar* and its derivatives, and see in all that you have said little or nothing from which to dissent. But you strangely in all this seem to overlook the very point in discussion, and which you ultimately have to concede, that *sacrifice has an effect upon God*. You appear to deny this in the commencement, but you cannot but admit it in the conclusion.

Now methinks the matter can be greatly simplified thus:—Sacrifice is atonement or propitiation as respects God; purification as respects sin; reconciliation as respects the human heart; justification as respects the sinner's conscience, and redemption as respects his person from all the penal consequences of sin. Atonement is, therefore, a grand cause; of which the prominent effects are, propitiation as respects God; purification as respects sin; reconciliation as respects the sinner; justification as respects his guilt; sanctification as respects his pollution, and redemption as respects his actual personal deliverance from sin in all its consequences. You seem, my dear sir, to labor on one point, as though it were with you a great difficulty. You seem desirous to make sacrifice affect only man. You have no doubt been horrified at some of the representations like that quoted from the Methodistic Discipline about Christ's reconciling God to man. The more intelligent of that community believe with you that God the Father sent his Son to be the Saviour of the world from his own benevolence, and that the atonement was in the divine nature and judgment necessary to justify God in justifying ungodly men—"that he might be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." It propitiated God in no other way than as it opened a just and honorable way for his grace to be exercised, or as it gave him a justifiable reason to be propitious. No intelligent professor of the faith imagines that God was incorrigible, cruel, antagonistic, full of vengeance, and inimical to fallen man; and that his Son our Lord was more compassionate and merciful, and came to quench the fire of his wrath, to placate his ire. Such Pagan notions are neither the faith nor the opinion of any of those denominated evangelical. A few ultras of former days may have so reasoned; but such spirits are too antique for the nineteenth century.

Your own views of sin-offerings, as detailed in your 2d epistle, are clearly expressed. You say, "The great design of sin-offering is to make atonement." But you make atonement only equivalent to reconciliation. But it means more in the Bible than the reconciliation of a sinner to God: therefore, until you more fully explain yourself, I object to your definition as *defective*. The design of sin-offerings is, indeed, to make reconciliation by making a propitiation for our sins, and by making it both just and merciful on the part of God to forgive us. But I wait your explanation of the various items on which I have commented. As I see you have sometimes misconceived me, it is possible I may have misunderstood you. Meanwhile I remain, as ever, yours in the kingdom of the Messiah,

A. CAMPBELL.

CONVERSION OF THE JEWS IN PALESTINE.

At the evening sitting of the General Assembly of Scotland, in the Tolbooth Church, Edinburgh, Wednesday, November 20, M'Cheyne, one of the deputation sent by the Church of Scotland to inquire into the state of the Jews in Palestine, made the following speech:—

Mr. M'Cheyne commenced by stating that he had hoped his reverend fathers Drs. Black and Keith would have arrived in this country long before himself and his friend Mr. Bonar. He was grieved on coming home to learn that they had been detained by sickness. It would be obviously improper to give a full report of the mission till they arrived; but when they did, they would be in a situation to lay before the church a full statement of all they had seen and heard. In the mean time he would lay before them a slight sketch of the work they had been engaged in, with a fact or two as encouragements to undertake the great and godlike work of seeking for the lost sheep of the house of Israel. The only deviation which they had made from the rule laid down for their guidance by the committee, was, that they did not pass through Russian Poland; the reason was, that the Russian Ambassador at Constantinople positively refused to sign their passports for that country, because they were ecclesiastics, and the Russian government had determined that no ecclesiastics should pass through Poland without leave obtained from the Emperor at St. Petersburg. They could not afford to wait for the arrival of this passport, and therefore they gave up the idea. Soon after they arrived in Syria, the deputation was obliged to separate, because Dr. Black felt the heat of the climate was too much for his constitution; and he and Dr. Keith departed for a colder climate, while Mr. Bonar and he proceeded to visit the cities in the north of Syria. They had engaged Mr. Calmer, a converted Israelite, to go with them to these places—to the cities of Tyre and Sidon, and to return with them to the continent of Europe. They did so, because he was skilled in all the languages which it was necessary to make use of in conversing with the Jews; and being a Jew himself, they had obtained information in that way which he (Mr. M'Cheyne) was satisfied they would not have obtained otherwise. They met with dangers and difficulties in their journey which were not met with by ordinary travellers. In Egypt the plague broke out on the very day of their arrival. When they came to Gaza they found the plague there. At Jerusalem the plague was also raging; and during the ten days of their stay in that city, five persons, on an average, died daily—these were for the most part Jews, because they are so poor, and are in such a wretched condition, that the plague makes the greatest ravages among them. While they were at quarantine at the foot of Mount Carmel, the plague broke out in the second tent from them; yet in all these dangers they were mercifully preserved; no evil befell them, nor plague came near their dwellings. He might also mention that on account of war between Egypt and Turkey, the Egyptian army was withdrawn from Syria, in consequence of which the Bedouins and other tribes who live by rapine and plunder, were spread all over the country; and as the deputation rode unarmed, they might easily have been made their prey; their servant was once robbed

and stripped of every thing; yet from this danger also the Lord delivered them; indeed, throughout their whole journey they felt that there was one going before them to prepare the way. They found kind friends in every country, and they were delivered from all the dangers which beset them. He would state a striking fact for the encouragement of the church in carrying the gospel to the Jews. It was simply this, that there was at this moment peculiar access to them in preaching the gospel. In all the countries they had visited, the only people to whom a Christian minister could go was the lost sheep of the house of Israel; for instance, they spent more than a week in Leghorn, in Tuscany. Leghorn was a free port, and Tuscany was the freest state in Italy, and yet in this free port and free state a Protestant minister dare not preach the gospel to the Roman Catholic population. If you give a tract or a Bible to a Roman Catholic, he carries it to his Priest, who takes it to the Magistrates, and you would be immediately banished from the country; and yet in the same place you may go freely and preach to the Jews. The fact is, that no man cares for their souls. The same fact is true, though not in the same degree, in Egypt and in Palestine. They dared not preach the gospel to the Mahometans. He believed the attempt would be followed by banishment or death; yet in these same countries they might fully and freely preach the gospel to the Jews. The same fact was true throughout all Syria; and at Constantinople, where there were 80,000 Jews, and where a missionary, who had attempted to preach to the Mahometans, had been sent away by the first vessel that sailed out of the harbor. In Moldavia and Wallachia the Greek church was established in a most superstitious degree, and the worship of pictures was carried to an offensive extent. If a missionary preached the gospel to them he would draw down upon his head the vengeance of the Holy Synod and of the government. They were told that if a missionary were sent to the Jews in these principalities, and attempt through over-zeal to convert a single Greek, that act would be fatal to the mission; so that the door there also is shut to all but the Jews. They had an interview with the Prince, who asked their object in coming, and they distinctly stated that they had been sent by the Church of Scotland out of love to the Jews, and that they had come to inquire into the state of that people, with a view to their conversion; so that the government knew their object perfectly, and yet no man forbade them. They also visited Austria, the government of which will allow no missionary to enter their dominions. They had been treated with great severity on suspicion that they were missionaries: their Bibles and papers were taken from them on purpose to discover whether they were missionaries or not. The government would not allow a minister even to preach the gospel to the Jews. But the encouraging fact was, that the Jews were ready to receive them; and though they knew that if they betrayed them they would be sent out of the country, yet they always found the synagogue a sanctuary. He once gave a Bible to a young Jew, who, wrapping it up in his mantle, said in his own language, "No one shall know of it." The deputation then left Austria, and came into Cracow, where they found matters very interesting. There are 22,000 Jews in that city, and a single missionary laboring among them; that missionary dared not preach the gospel to the Popish population.

Popery was little known in this country, else it would be little favored. Idolatry was there carried to a hideous length, and if he preached the gospel to them, he would be stoned to death before he reached his own door. Still that missionary was engaged day and night in preaching to the Jews. In Prussian Poland even, though Prussia is a Protestant government, and though the king was a contributor to missions, and he believed at heart a good man; yet even there a Christian missionary dared not preach the gospel to the poor deluded rationalists; but, by a law of the land, every pulpit in the country would be opened to a Jewish missionary if he preached to the Jews. One missionary told him that he had often preached in a Lutheran church to three or four hundred Jews. Another remarkable fact was, that there were in that country seven missionary schools, where the Jewish children were trained up in the Christian religion. The Jews in Prussia were in a most interesting state; they were so far enlightened that they had thrown away the Talmud; but they had not, like their German brethren, thrown away the Bible also. They were half between Judaism and infidelity, and were at present perfectly open to receive the gospel. Twelve years ago they would not enter a Protestant place of worship. He was firmly persuaded that twelve years hence, if no effort was previously made to rescue them, they would be sunk in the deepest infidelity. There were 74,000 Jews in the Grand Duchy of Posen alone. He concluded by exhorting the church to persevere in the attempt to carry the gospel to the Jews, on the ground that if they did so they would not go unrewarded. He believed that the prediction of Balaam was still in force—"Bessed is he that blesseth thee, and cursed is every one that curseth thee." They had seen the curse which had fallen on unhappy Poland because she had cursed Israel; and they would yet see the blessing fall on happy Scotland if she blessed Israel. If they carried the gospel to the Jews all their parishes would be revived and refreshed as Kilsyth had been. The elements of controversy that now disfigured the church would be swept away; the jarrings and jealousies in the church courts would give place to the harmony of prayer and praise; and their own hearts would become as a well-watered garden which the Lord had blessed.

Journal of Christianity.

I am glad to add, as a *finale* to "Christians among the Sects," the following explanation of the writer's design in the essay and statement of his object. May it have the desired effect! We want to see just that state of things and formation of character, so well portrayed by Mr. Harris. A. C.

POSITIVE ORDINANCES.

CONCLUSION.

HAVING now briefly given my views of the principal ordinances called *positive*, I shall conclude by giving the sum of the matter. I have endeavored, I trust successfully, to show that positive ordinances have something more than *mere authority* to recommend them to our

observance. I have endeavored to show that they were founded in the reason and fitness of things. But this has not been seen by all; and, therefore, I have labored to show, among the secondary considerations, that a mistake with regard to any one of those positive ordinances, did not necessarily imply any perversity of heart. "But the moral precepts (as Bishop Butler observes,) commend themselves to our reason, although not enforced by divine authority; for they are written on the heart." But, as the same author affirms, "the positive ordinances are also *moral*."

The primary object of these essays has been, not to prove, as some suppose, that there are Christians among the sects; but to call the attention of the brethren every where to the vitality of our religion—to greater spirituality—to the cultivation of the heart—the affections! "Keep thy heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life." I devoutly hope and pray that my brethren may not seek to defeat my object by making these essays the subject of strife and "vain jangling." I trust that my brethren will see, in my views on baptism, that I attach due importance to that institution. I shall, therefore, conclude with the words of another, in a work titled "The Great Teacher," by John Harris. In discussing the spirituality of our Lord's teaching, after having shown that sin reigns over the whole man by taking possession of the *heart*, and must therefore be dislodged, he says—

"Religion, then, the antagonist force which is to expel sin from our nature, must be conveyed into the same seat, must meet the enemy on its own ground, must attack and vanquish it in its strong hold. 'Make the tree good,' says Christ, 'and the fruit will be good.' Our visible piety must be the fruit of a tree whose roots are struck deep in the heart.

"The loftiest distinction in his kingdom he reserved for the pure in heart. According to a law in nature which universally prevails, a change in the constitution of any creature is followed by a corresponding change in his condition. When changed from pollution to purity, his people shall be blessed by purity, be brought into the presence of celestial purity, be beloved by infinite purity, shall ascend to the beatific vision of God as to their original birthright. 'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.'

"While leading his disciples into the presence of God, he impressed on them what they were chiefly to implore; they were to solicit that all-comprehending gift, the Holy Spirit: a gift which, from its very nature, would demand their heart for the place of its reception. And if it be found impossible, owing to a fixed and infallible law of our being, to associate even with a fellow-mortal without receiving moral modification, a degree of assimilation to his character; how can the supreme, the ever-active and all-assimilating Spirit, take up his abode in the midst of our nature without changing the heart and conforming it to his own holiness.

"Placing himself between the mercy-seat and the crowd of heartless worshippers that beset it, he shamed their vain ostentation, silenced their endless repetitions and lifting up the drapery of the breast, he showed them to themselves hollow and heartless, and dismissed them with denunciations instead of blessings. Having removed the hypocritical throng, he sought to surround the footstool of grace with Israelites indeed. To engage their affections in prayer, he taught them to call the Being they addressed by the endearing name of Father; thus allaying their fears, and awakening and consecrating their filial instincts to devotion. To call forth the ardor of their souls, he held up a prize of prayer before their eyes; gave to it the most alluring names; called it imperishable wealth—good things—the Holy Spirit—eternal life; or, as though no language could describe the efficacy he would assign to prayer, he assured them that ask what they would it should be done for them; that they should find the treasury of heaven, and all the resources of God, open and accessible to them.

"To show them the triumph of feeling over form, he brought them by parable into the temple, and directed their attention to two worshippers—the one, a pharisee, standing erect before God; loud and voluble, with nothing but virtues to recount; the envy of his nation, the pride of his sect: the other a publican, one of the refuse of the people; bowed, dejected, self-condemned; his eyes seeking the dust; his heart swollen even to bursting; his utterance choked; smiting upon his breast as the seat of all his agony and disease; able only to articulate, 'God be merciful to me a sinner.' But while the former is sent empty away, he shows them the other returning to his house, rich in the favor of God; forgiven, justified, happy. Thus he taught them that prayer is a sigh, a tear, a look, an act of prostration, a transaction of the soul with heaven, an affair in which the only office of the tongue is to unload the freighted and overflowing heart, and relieve it of its oppressive fulness. He encouraged and urged them, by his own example, by arguments, by parables, by appeals to the parental affections of their nature, by explicit promises, to ask, to seek, to knock, to set no bounds to their importunity, to give unlimited scope and ardor to their desires; and that no doubt of welcome and success might obtrude to check the full flow and outpouring of their souls to God, he affirmed it to be an invariable principle of the divine government, that every one that asketh, receiveth. And likening his new and evangelical church to a kingdom, and the entrance to it to a strait gate and a narrow way, a defile in which hell has posted its archers to dispute the passage, he cheered them to the onset; bade them, though at the risk of an eye, a hand, or even life itself, to agonize, to force their way as with a spasm of energy, and seize that kingdom by storm.

"Devotion, which, to be pure and vital, must derive its supplies like the living stream, by hidden communication with the parent ocean, he found cut off from the great Fountain of life, and made to consist in artificial jet-works and devices for proud and public display. Its seclusive character was entirely gone. As if the only aliment on which it could live was publicity, as if its value depended entirely on the degree in which it was seen, its favorite resorts were the chief seats in the synagogues, the corners of the streets, and the market-place. Tired of the closet, and even of the sanctuary, devotion, or

that which passed for it, had brought forth all its symbols and apparatus which should have been sacred to secresy, spread them abroad before the public eye, and transacted its high and solemn affairs with heaven at the sound of the trumpet, and in the broad glare of day. Reprobating this shameless ostentation as hypocrisy, he assigned to it its only legitimate reward, the notice of man, the barren applause of congenial hypocrisy, and left it withering under the frown of God. But taking the subject of sincere devotion by the hand, he led him to a hushed and secret recess; and, closing the door, secluded him from the noise and observation of the world, and left him alone with God; there to forget all things but God and himself; there to discover, in his connatural affinity and sympathy with God, the hidden and dormant dignity of his own nature; and thence to come forth, rich in the smiles of his heavenly Father; and, like a priest fresh from a cloud of incense, suffused with the holy fragrance of his divine employment."

CHRISTIANOS.

CORRESPONDENCE

Louisville, November 13th, 1839

Dear Sir—In behalf of the Literary Association of Louisville, we request a copy of your Introductory Lecture to a course of Popular Lectures, for publication.

Believing, as we do, that its publication will eminently enhance the value of the principles which it advocated, and the cause for which it was delivered, and disseminate widely matter too valuable to be trusted to evanescent recollections, we hope you will not hesitate to accede to the wishes of the Association which we represent.

THEODORE S. BELL,
THOMAS H SHREVE,
GEO. W. WEISSINGER,
} *Committee.*

ALEXANDER CAMPBELL.

Lexington, November 18, 1839.

Gentlemen—The favorable opinion that you have expressed of the principles and truths in the introductory lecture which I had the honor to deliver in the presence of your Association, constrains me to comply with your request, although I have to regret that the immense pressure of business on hand during the time allotted for its preparation, prevented that concentration of mind and reflection which a subject of such transcendant importance demands. But, gentlemen, if in your judgment it may at all subserve the object for which it was delivered, such as it is, I tender it as a proof of my willingness in any way to contribute to the benevolent object of your Association.

Please present my cordial respects to the members of your Association, and accept for yourselves the assurance of my unfeigned personal regard and esteem.

A. CAMPBELL.

Messrs. *T. S Bell, T H. Shreve, G. W. Weissinger.*

AN ADDRESS

ON THE

AMELIORATION OF THE SOCIAL STATE,

Delivered at the request of a Literary Association, as introductory to a course of popular lectures in Louisville.—By A. CAMPBELL.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN—

IT is not always that the *subject* and the *object* of an address can be made to harmonize. The good of the state, or the glory of God, has been the subject of many a speech; while, alas! too often the object has been the speaker's own.

In popular addresses my predilections are generally on the side of having the subject and the object to agree. On the present occasion, therefore, after considerable indecision, I have chosen the AMELIORATION OF THE SOCIAL STATE as the *subject;* and however I may succeed in my endeavors, I do assure you that it is the *object* of my present address.

There is also, I am happy to think, a congruity between my subject and the object of the association at whose solicitation I have the honor, on this occasion, to appear before you. The object of that course of lectures, of which this is but the introductory one, as it is of the gentlemen who have volunteered in this cause, is, the improvement of the social condition of man They have very justly decided that an elevation of the standard of intellectual and moral excellence would be eminently conducive to a higher cultivation and refinement of the social feelings of our nature, and consequently to the amelioration of the social state. In pursuance of these views and convictions, they have instituted this series of addresses—not so much, perhaps, to enlighten your understandings, as to enlist your affections, and secure your efforts in the noblest and most benevolent of human undertakings—the positive advancement of the moral conditions of our social existence.

But the term *society* is somewhat vague, and the thing itself covers an area as variegated and diverse as it is immense. Society is not the mere juxtaposition of ten, or ten thousand persons: it is, in its full comprehension, the union of a simple plurality, or of a multitude, or of the human race in all common interests. It is not the local or personal nearness of those who may inhabit the same city, the same village, the same house, the same room, (for these often have as much society with their antipodes as with one another;) but it is the union, communion, and copartnery of a few, or of the whole race with one another, in all that is human and divine in our nature.

But we sometimes speak of society in a less strict and philosophic sense. We use the term as commensurate with the term community, the entire population of a given district—those united in mere local and political interests. Such masses of our species are frequently styled societies only in reference to some two or three general interests, which may be as diverse from one another as the countries and the climates which they inhabit. There is, indeed, in our nature such a tendency to assimilation, that those societies which inhabit the same quarter of the globe, or have any, the least intercourse with one another, do, in process of time, exhibit such points of common resemblance as easily to distinguish them from those who seldom or never

have any intercourse with them. Hence those prominent differential attributes of Asiatic, African, European, and American societies.

Society, indeed, even in reference to these more prominent points of common interest, is continually in motion, in transition from one state to another, insomuch that in a few centuries the inhabitants of the same country differ from their ancestors in their interests, manners, customs, and social rites, as much as the child differs from the sage, or the natives of Nova Zembla from those of the Cape of Good Hope. When, however, we speak of an amelioration of the social state, we have not exclusive reference to that little community of which we may happen to be a component part; but to that great community of communities which fills up the whole circle of our national intercourse. And for our encouragement in the work of amelioration, it is an exhilarating truth that no person's influence is necessarily limited to that society in which he moves. Individuals have often through their immediate society acted upon other societies, and have thus extended their influence from city to city, and from nation to nation, to the utmost extent of an extensive empire In this way it came to pass, that Aristotle the philosopher of Stagira, Plato of Athens, Paul of Tarsus, and Luther of Saxony, have stamped their image not only upon their own city, their own country or generation, but upon nations and empires for an indefinite series of ages.

But it would be necessary to the full completion of our purpose, and it would be as curious as it is necessary, to contemplate society both *as it was*, and *as it now is*, in some given district, with special reference to what it *ought to be* in regard to the entire demands of human nature in its best attainable state in this world. This, indeed, in all its amplitude, would be a sweep by far too large for a single address. For the sake of a few facts and documents as data, we must, however, glance, very briefly indeed, at the causes that have conspired in giving to modern Europe and to these United States their present civilization, their present superiority over their more remote ancestors, and over all other portions of the human race.

The present state of society in this commonwealth, in the United States, in England, in Europe, in the world, is the effect of a thousand causes, both co-operative and antagonist, the history of which it is impossible to trace. These causes, first hidden in the deep and unexplored recess of human nature, work for a time, as the secret fires under the mountains, unnoticed, unobserved till on some favorable crisis they produce a shaking, an earthquake, a revolution; then, and only then, they impress themselves upon the observation of man, excite his admiration, call forth his philosophy, and direct his energies

into correspondent action. Such, indeed, have been all the primary causes, facts, and events that have conspired and amalgamated in the present improvements of European and American society. But as the geographer sees not the atoms that compose the mountains which he describes, so the historian perceives not that infinity of little facts, feelings, motives, actions, which co-operated and combined in one of those grand and prominent facts or events which he records. His task it is to trace these minor agencies who would understand the mysteries of human revolutions from civilization to barbarism, and again from barbarism to civilization.

The fall of the Roman Empire, the last of the four imperial Pagan despotisms, was indeed an awfully sublime and transcendant fact, and essentially connected with the state of society in the city of Louisville at this very moment. But who can trace with persuasive accuracy to the original fountains that memorable series of stupendous revolutions which, in little more than thirteen centuries, broke to atoms that "splendid fabric of human greatness?" Who can trace every little rill, and brook, and stream, and river that swelled the current of that mighty flood which swept from the earth those colossal monuments of human genius, science, art, and enterprize?

The historian faithfully records that wonderful succession of triumphs, which, in seven full centuries, raised the municipality of Rome—a single city—to be the mistress of the world. He records, with admiration, the profound policy of its Senate, the emulation of its Consuls, the valor and heroism of its soldiers, which subjected to the imperial sceptre of Augustus that immense region reaching from the Euphrates on the east, to the Atlantic on the west; and from the Rhine and the Danube on the north, to the sandy deserts of Arabia and Africa on the south. He tells also of its farther extension in the first century—of the conquest of Dacia, of Britain, even to the Highlands of Scotland, and of provinces beyond the Tigris and the Euphrates in the east.

As faithfully he records the grand facts that hastened its decline and precipitated its fall; the disastrous defeats which, in rapid succession, humbled its pride and ultimately left scarce a vestige of its former strength and glory. But, in doing all this, how many occult causes are unobserved; how many secret facts are untold; how many fortuitous, but concurring agencies, are unnoticed; how many recondite workings of the human heart are never known; which, though not the immediate, were nevertheless the true and active sources of all that is told by the historian, or commented on by the philosopher?

Notwithstanding these difficulties in our way to comprehend the

phenomena of many of the acts in the great drama of States and Empires; of the revolutions and counter revolutions of society; he who would understand the past, or anticipate the future, by looking minutely into all that is written, examining and comparing the actors and the actions, and reasoning from the facts passing before him in his daily converse with himself and his fellows, may have a general, and a correct, though not a complete knowledge of the remote and proximate causes of the overthrow and ruin of the ancient States, as well as of the elements and forces that have given, as their natural and proper result, the present society in which we are all so deeply and so necessarily interested.

Our American society is the result of Spanish, German, French, and English civilization—that is the result of European civilization—that is the consequence of the downfall of the Roman Empire, itself originally composed of the most civilized and improved portions of Asia, Africa, and Europe—that fall was the effect of the incursions of those immense swarms of northern barbarians, which, like a torrent from the mountains, rolled, wave after wave, over the whole face of the Roman Empire, from the banks of the Danube to the shores of the Atlantic, and placed itself in whole nations in the finest portions of the subjugated lands of the Western Empire.

Now he who would possess just and comprehensive views of American society—of that singular compound of race, of genius, and of character, which now individualizes, distinguishes, and elevates the American family, must not only begin with the decline and fall of the Roman Empire, but he must push his inquiries to the ancient lands of the Huns, the Goths, the Vandals, the hundred tribes and nations of ancient Germany and Asiatic Scythia; he must visit the plains beyond the Oxus and the Jaxartes; he must go to Mount Caucassus, and trace the meanderings of a hundred rivers, along plains five thousand miles in length and one thousand in breadth, before he finds the germs of his own greatness—the root and origin of his own family—and the causes of the political institutions, manners, and customs of his own country. This, indeed, is a work as far beyond the ambition, as it is beyond the means and opportunities of a vast majority of our contemporaries.

Monsieur Guizot, one of the ablest of the statesmen of France—one of the wisest of her philosophers—in his recent general history of the civilization of modern Europe, a work of great erudition and of thrilling interest, in tracing the immediate elements of European society, commences with the fall of the Roman Empire. He finds the rudiments of all European institutions and improvements in a few great facts, of which he speaks with great familiarity and precision. From

Rome he supposes we have got the archetypes of all our municipal and imperial ideas. From the barbarians that destroyed it, and located themselves within its bounds, we have got our greatest polish—our ideas of liberty, independence, and loyalty.

Modern civilization, according to this historian, was at its origin and throughout its whole history, "diversified, agitated, and confused." At the beginning of the fifth century he has found "Municipal society, Christian society, Barbarian society;" these three agonizing in the same field, and struggling for the ascendant. To use his own words: "We find these societies very differently organized, founded upon principles totally opposite, inspiring men with sentiments altogether different. We find the love of the most absolute independence by the side of the most devoted submission; military patronage by the side of ecclesiastic domination; spiritual power and temporal power every where together; the canons of the church—the learned legislation of the Romans—the almost unwritten customs of the barbarians—every where a mixture, or rather co-existence of nations, of languages, of social institutions, of manners, of ideas, of impressions the most diversified."

To the confusion, the tossings and jostlings of these elements, he assigns the slow progress of Europe, the storms by which she has been buffeted, and the miseries to which she has often been a prey. These, however, are with him the real elements of European civilization.

Like a mass of heterogeneous ingredients thrown into the same vessel, by their intestine motion—their antagonistic operations, the soft and more ethereal particles rarified and subtilized ascend, while the grosser and more feculent materials sink to the bottom, and leave the pure liquor to be drawn off by itself; so these remains of ancient society thrown together into the European caldron, worked, fermented, effervesced, till drawn off in various casks, the new wine of European civilization is found in many nations, and still greatly improved by being shipped across the Atlantic and racked off into so many sovereign and independent States.

The ruling passion and principle of Roman society was the city corporation—the municipal mode of life. Indeed, the Roman empire, first, midst, and last, was but a confederacy of cities. Ancient Italy alone contained 1,197 cities; Gaul boasted of 1,200; Spain, of 360; three hundred African cities at one time acknowledged the authority of Carthage; and in the time of the Cesars, Asia Minor alone counted 500 populous cities. Here are but five members of the Roman empire, a mere fraction of its territory, containing 3,557 cities—on the other hand, the conquerors of Rome came from the immense plains of

Scythia, or from the deep and dense forests of ancient Germany—wandering tribes—nations in camps, whose delights were the wild mountains, the deep vallies, the extended plains, the mighty rivers, the ocean's roar, the tented fields, the forest chase, unbounded freedom, the independence of unmeasured tracts of land. In the beginning of the fifth century the Christian religion had been corrupted into a hierarchy—it had become a state engine; it had, therefore, lost its spirit, its purity, its original power; yet, as an ecclesiastic institution, it had power over the empire, conquered its conquerors, and was, beyond doubt, the most puissant element of the new compound.

Such was the crisis of the dissolution of the Roman Empire, and such was the commencement of the new process. In Europe was then found the democratic, the aristocratic, the monarchical, the imperial, the despotic, the theocratic principle at work, in proximity, in amalgamation, in compromise and in strife, struggling for precedency. Violence ruled the day. There was no legitimacy but might! All claimed something else—antiquity, priority, reason, justice, right; yet it actually was *might* that gave *right* to all.

For some six or seven centuries the territory of the ancient Roman Empire was one immense wreck—a perfect chaos—"a universal jumble"—nothing was permanent, nothing systematic—the Koran and the sword in the East—the Roman hierarchy, legitimacy, and persecution, feudalism, despotism, anarchy, mutation in the West—freemen, fideles, freedmen, and slaves, made up the four chief masses of the new nations. But all was in motion; "no man continued long in the same rank; no rank continued long the same." Every thing triumphs in its turn: feudalism triumphs, the church triumphs, monarchy triumphs, the right of compulsion in religion triumphs, the amalgamation of spiritual and temporal power in the same hands triumphs, barbarism triumphs. Again, free cities rise, charters rise, new classes rise, central government, and the centralization system rise in public esteem—Peter the hermit is born—the crusades are planned—all Europe for the first time sympathizes—the spirit of the recovery of the holy sepulchre, the deliverance of the holy city, inspires all Europe, animates all classes, kings and beggars, church and state, savage and civilized. Millions of men and money are put in motion; immense armies are raised, commanded by kings in person; a hundred years scarce quench the fervors of this holy war. But it finally expired. The Koran and the scimitar were too strong for an imagination, and a mad impulse, or rather the spirit of the age had changed; the causes, moral and social, that had thrown Europe into Asia ceased to exist; new views, new feelings, new objects seized the European

minds. During the crusades the laity had been too often in Rome; they had seen too much of the character of their own priesthood, the nakedness of the land appeared, the selfish and worldly spirit of their own pastors in contrast with those of the Turks, astonished them. Their newly acquired knowledge inspired them with a freedom of thought, a boldness hitherto unknown in Europe, their souls were enlarged, "more political freedom and more political unity characterized the subsequent age." The compass—printing and gunpowder—the Lutheran reformation and the English revolution, changed the entire aspect of society in those countries that gave the original nucleus of American society.

"The history of European society may be thrown," says Guizot, "into three great periods: first, a period which I shall call that of *origin* or *formation*, during which the different elements of society disengage themselves from chaos, assume an existence, and show themselves in their native forms, with the principles by which they are animated: this period lasted till almost the twelfth century. The second period is a period of experiments, attempts, groping: the different elements of society approach and enter into combination, feeling each other, as it were, without producing any thing general, regular, or durable: this state of things, to say the truth, *did not terminate till the sixteenth century*. Then comes the period of development, in which human society in Europe takes a definite form, follows a determinate direction, proceeds rapidly and with a general movement towards a clear and precise object: this is the period which began in the sixteenth century and is now pursuing its course."

After this general, alas! too general sketch of the progress of social improvement, you will perhaps be curious to know the opinion of so eminent a philosopher and historian as to the present state of civilization in the most polished nations in Europe—in the world. It is an opinion in which I cordially concur—an opinion in which many of the greatest and most cultivated minds acquiesce. It is this:—

"*Society and civilization are yet in their childhood.* However great the distance they have advanced, that which they have before them is incomparably, is infinitely greater. Thus speaks one who, as he imagines, lives at "the centre, at the focus of the civilization of Europe;" who has made himself intimately acquainted with its past history, and with its present condition.

Ladies and gentlemen, after such a declaration you will, perhaps, expect from me a definition of this term; you will ask, What is meant by *civilization?* Our historian regards civilization as a *fact;* "two circumstances are necessary to its existence—it lives upon two con-

ditions—it reveals itself by two symptoms—the progress of society—the progress of individuals—the amelioration of the social system, and the expansion of the mind and faculties of man. Wherever the exterior condition of man becomes enlarged, quickened, improved, and wherever the intellectual nature of man distinguishes itself by its energy, its brilliancy, and its grandeur, wherever these two signs concur—and they often do so, notwithstanding the greatest imperfections in the social system—there man proclaims and applauds civilization." So says our philosopher.

But, perhaps, for some minds it may be too abstruse—the definition is more unintelligible than the term itself. Well, we shall contrast civilization with barbarism—savages of all ages, it is agreed, have a common character. Two demons divide the empire of the savage heart—*selfishness* and *terror*: lust, hatred, and revenge minister to the former; while credulity, superstition, and cruelty attend upon the latter. The description given of our savage ancestors, the Huns, the Goths, the Scythians, the Scandinavians that overran all Europe, from the Caspian sea to the Thames, admirably illustrates the savage character, and demonstrates these simple but strong passions, variously combined and excited by surrounding circumstances, to be the true criteria of barbarism. Now as we recede from these we advance in civilization.

Civilization is not, therefore, merely intellectual culture, refinement of taste, high advances in criticism, eloquence, philosophy; nor is it eminence in the fine arts of poetry, music, painting, sculpture, architecture. The Greeks and Romans equalled, if not excelled us far, in most of these attainments; yet, compared with many of this community, they were an uncivilized and barbarous people. They lived and died under the tyranny of selfishness and terror. Their amusements, their exhibitions, their amphitheatres, their gladiator feats and pastimes were cruel, inhuman—full of lust, hatred, and revenge. In fact, man, fully civilized, is wholly rescued from the tyranny of selfishness, lust, hatred, revenge, terror, cruelty, credulity, and superstition. Till this is accomplished society has not reached that intellectual, benevolent, pacific, moral, and blissful goal, to which it has been advancing, with a slow but steady pace, since the commencement of the sixteenth century.

Man is fully civilized when all the powers of his animal, intellectual, moral, and religious nature are fully developed in subordination to his ultimate and eternal destiny; and society is perfectly civilized when all the members of it, in their respective places, stations, and conditions, fully receive and reciprocate all the genuine feelings and

expressions of benevolence, brotherly kindness and charity, dictated by a refined sensibility and guided by an enlarged and cultivated understanding.

Thus, by a long and circuitous route, I have arrived at the main subject of my address. I now especially invite your attention to the influence of woman and of the Bible in carrying forward the begun amelioration of the social state.

There are two facts pretermitted, two powers unappreciated by Monsieur Guizot and by all writers on civilization known to me. These are the two superlative agencies in the amelioration of the social state; they are woman and the Bible, or if any pleases to make but one out of two, it is *the Bible in the hand and heart of woman.*

I admit that the philosopher gives great power to the church, and makes it the chief element of European civilization. But with him it has not more power than the Koran and the Mosque among the Moslems; or the temples, altars, and priests among the Pagans. The hallowed fanes among the Druids, the altars among the Pagans, and the Mosque among the Mahometans, have led the way in their civilization quite as much as the church of Rome in the dark ages has led the way in ours. Nevertheless I concur with our philosophic historian in giving to the church the precedence in all that appertains to our civilization: for I am persuaded that take that element out of his own compound agencies, and we would have all been barbarians still. But I mean more than the Church as defined by him, when I speak of woman and the Bible. Permit me then to explain myself.

Woman, with me, is to society what the spirit is to the body; for as the body without the spirit is dead, society without woman is dead also. She is then the quickening, animating, conservative element of society. If man on this terraqueous ball be the glory of God, most certainly woman is the glory of man. She is the life, the beauty, the ornament, the glory of society. What a simple, powerful, and sublime preface has God written to the volume of her history. "It is not good," said he, "that man should be alone;" and instantly out of his side, and by his side, stood blooming, smiling, lovely woman. Never was any being more appropriately named than this woman. She is called *Eve*, which in our own language is equivalent to her being called *life*. And Adam called her *life*, because she is the mother of all living. She is then the fountain and source of society.

Now, her intellectual and moral culture, her elevation to her own proper rank, which is not to sit at the *foot*, but to stand by the *side* of man, is of supreme importance to the State, to the Church, to the world, and to the amelioration of the social system. But this subject

has never yet taken hold of the head, the heart, or the hand of man in the ratio of its importance; because, perhaps, the power of woman for good or evil, for weal or for woe, has not yet appeared in its full proportions to the mental vision of even the sages and the learned of our race. She is, indeed, in some points of view, rightly called "the weaker vessel" of the twain: but in this her weakness are found some of the main springs of her power.

It is essential to our argument, so far as the logic of it is concerned, that we first form a clear and definite idea of *the power of woman*. But how shall this be done convincingly? Not by reasoning hypothetically nor speculatively, but inductively. As we find out the power of any agent in nature, so learn we the power of woman. The power of electricity, of the tempest, of the flood, is seen in their effects; the power of woman is seen and felt in her deeds—I do not say in her *good* deeds only, but in her *bad* deeds also; for she, too, as well as man, has some bad deeds. Still it is fair logic to infer the power of doing good, from her power of doing evil; and in placing this matter before you, ladies and gentlemen, you will allow me to avail myself of a fair specimen of female achievements both on the side of virtue and of vice.

It is not necessary that we examine the whole history of the sex to be convinced of the potency of woman. The first melancholy proof, and perhaps as striking a proof as universal history affords, of the power of woman is found at the close of the first act of the great drama of human existence—she persuaded her husband to rebel against his God. Adam seems to have been so perfectly fascinated by her charms and bewitched by her blandishments, as to have lost both his reason and his loyalty at the moment that she stretched out her enchanting hand to his lips. "He was not deceived" by the serpent, as Paul affirms. May we not thence infer that he was allured and captivated by his wife? How unspeakably great, then, was that power which overcame man in the glory of his strength and prostrated his understanding and his resolution in the very presence of the pledge of inevitable ruin.

Since that moment of triumph of Satan over woman, and of woman over man, who can tithe the spoils of history, or form even a miniature view of her power over human destiny. She never had any pretensions to physical superiority over man—to physical equality; but really some of the brightest triumphs of genius, of intellect, of contrivance, of policy, of the arts both of peace and of war, that brighen the annals of human greatness, and throw a halo of glory over our nature are found in the memoirs of woman.

In the first two thousand years of human history, and in all the sacred records of twenty centuries, the names of but five women, good or bad, have escaped the general wreck and oblivion of ancient times. Of these five, Eve, the mother of all living, is the first; and Sarah, the mystic mother of all the faithful, is the last. Her faith and her virtues, her conjugal affection and devotion, not only overcame the course of nature itself, and gave to her husband and the world "the child of promise," but also furnish one of the most perfect models of domestic excellence, of maternal worth, and of female complaisance which sacred history affords. Why there should have been so great silence from Adam to Moses of the sayings and doings of woman, is only to be explained on the hypothesis that the dark shade which in an evil hour her folly had entailed upon herself, her husband, and posterity, seems to have fallen upon her own history for almost one-third the whole flight of time. The influence of woman is, indeed, a second time adduced in the annals of the antediluvian world: but there, alas! it is in unison with a second catastrophe of human kind—a second witness but too strictly accordant with the first, that woman's power in doing evil, in congenial circumstances, is not easily exaggerated. "The sons of God," says the divine historian Moses, a heavenly style for the faithful of all ages,—"the sons of God intermixed with the daughters of men," making their beauty, without regard to moral excellence, the supreme attraction; till the world was filled with personal combat, murder, and rapine, (all couched in the word violence,) and became, even to the long-suffering of Heaven, intolerably wicked. This state of things superinduced that tremendous deluge whose monuments are stereotyped in the deep vallies, and on the lofty mountains that diversify the four quarters of the globe.

Opening the post-diluvian pages of sacred and profane history, we are, indeed, occasionally furnished with a bright display of feminine power, culminating over the highest summits of masculine ambition. In ascending the stream of Assyrian history almost to its fountain, we see the memory of her greatness, engraven on the proudest trophies of human grandeur. Do we commence our inquiries with the first and most magnificent of earthly empires—the Assyrian?—we shall find her mighty deeds contemporaneous with its origin. Who laid the foundation of mighty Babylon, the city of eternal fame, the wonder of the world—the metropolis of that gigantic empire that stretched from the fountains of the Tigris and the Euphrates to the oceans of the East and of the West—that mighty empire that withstood the tossings of a thousand tempests—the swellings of angry seas—the tumults of incensed and impassioned multitudes for more than fourteen hundred

years—who before the Macedonian hero led an army of three and a half millions of troops across the Indus to extend her dominions in the East, and for the long term of forty years gave laws to the fairest and best portions of the human race? I say, do we put these questions to the historians of ancient times? They give us the name of Semiramis, the widow of the founder of Nineveh, the Queen of the Queens of the East. In the life and achievements of this peerless heroine of fortunes so various and splendid, though ultimately disastrous, we discover faculties as enlarged, policies as profound, energy as unbounded, perseverance as untiring, courage as dauntless, ambition as towering as ever distinguished an Assyrian, Persian, or Grecian chief.

But if woman have power to create and raise up families, cities, states, and empires, she has power to destroy them. Thus if Babylon rose, Troy fell, by a woman. The ill fortunes and overthrow of the Trojan commonwealth are as intimately associated in fame, with the beauty and perfidy of Hèlen, as are the rise and glory of Babylon, with the intrepidity, energy, and varied talents of Semiramis I am of opinion that there never was a nation, a state, or an empire—not even an administration, save that of General Jackson, that was not more or less reared or ruined, strengthened or weakened, controlled or managed, by the policy, the skill, or the dexterity of woman.

Should any one doubt this opinion, let him examine the records of the Assyrian, Persian, Grecian, Roman, or modern European woman; he will find there were other Rebeccas, Miriams, Deborahs, Delilahs, Jaels, Jezebels, Athaliahs, Esthers, Herodiases, than those written in sacred history. Should he wish for a few samples of the dark, as well as the bright side of the picture, let him contemplate the deeds of vengeance, barbarity, and general inhumanity of Amestris, wife of the Persian Xerxes. Her demand at a royal banquet for the wife of Masistus, and her treatment of that woman, in more points than one, resembles that of the vengeful Herodias towards John the Harbinger. Let him consider the workings of jealousy and ambition in the bloody and horrible deeds of the Queen mother of Cyrus. Let him examine the confederated strength of these evil passions in the proceedings of Queen Parysites, both sister and wife of Darius Nothus, towards the no less cruel Queen Statira, daughter of Darius II. A bear robbed of her whelps was milder far than Queen Parysites towards those who were accessory to the slaughter of Cyrus, her son. Let him read, if he can without inexpressible horror, her cruelties to a Carian soldier, to Mithridates, to Mesabates, consummated in the murder of her own daughter in-law, the beautiful, but cruel and murderous Queen Statira

And should he wish for a perfect sample of all this category of attributes, we would refer him to the history and fortunes of the Egyptian Queen Cleopatra, the ninth of that name distinguished in ancient history. This celebrated woman far excelled all her contemporaries in the rarest assemblage of extraordinary endowments, and splendid crimes; possessing wit, imagination, genius, in no ordinary measures, superlative in beauty of person, in all the bewitching blandishments of elegant manners; in all the captivating arts of fascination, she was the slave of passion, vain, deceitful, ambitious, tyrannical, cruel. Under all her unrivalled charms was concealed a demoniacal heart, full of malignant passions, stratagems, plots, amours, murders, suicide. She permitted herself to be carried into the presence of Julius Cesar that she might subdue him by her charms. She did so. She also beguiled and ruined the unfortunate Anthony. Her voyage to Tarsus is one of the most pompous and glittering pageants in ancient history. It is said that the stern of her ship flamed with gold, its sails were purple, its oars inlaid with silver. Her pavillion on deck was of golden cloth, in which she sat robed like Venus, surrounded by the most beautiful virgins of her court, some representing the Nereiades, and others the Graces; instead of trumpets were heard flutes, hautboys, harps, and innumerable instruments warbling the softest airs, to which the oars kept time and completed the harmony; perfumes smoked upon the deck; while the banks of the river, lined with countless multitudes of spectators, gave to the spectacle a brilliancy and pomp never surpassed. The end of this voyage was to captivate the heart of Anthony, in which she was for him, alas! too successful. She boasted to Anthony that she could spend a million of livres at a single supper. This, indeed, she well nigh did by snatching from one of her ears the costliest pearl in the world, worth about that incredible sum, and casting it into a cruse of vinegar, dissolved it, and thus drank the health of the grandson of Cicero, one of the triumvirate of Rome.

The Romans, indeed, always acknowledged the mighty sway of woman. Faustina, daughter of the pious Antonine, celebrated for her beauty and gallantries, so ruled her husband, Marcus, that he not only elevated her lovers to the highest honors, but also so influenced the Senate as to declare her a goddess, and, with the attributes of Juno, Venus, and Ceres, to have divine honors paid to her in her temples.

Julia Maesa, by her genius and her largesses, raised her grandson, the execrable Bassianus, sometimes called Antoninias, but better known by the name of Elagabalus, a Syrian by birth, first to be the High Priest of the Sun, and next to be the Emperor of Rome. After he had careered the dark and dismal race of every folly, and covered

himself with the infamy of every monstrous deed that could disgrace humanity, murdered by his own indignant pretorians and cast into the Tiber, she still had the address to raise her second grandson by another mother to the imperial throne; and placed Alexander Severus on the list of Roman Emperors, while his mother Mamaea really empired over Rome.

But lest we should seem to draw from the records of Pagan times too many proofs of woman's ill-fated empire over the destiny of man, before we open the annals of modern Europe we shall give another and a somewhat different picture of female greatness in the person of the Queen of Palmyra, pupil of "the Sublime Longinus," well skilled in the Latin, Greek, Syriac, and Egyptian tongues.

After avenging the murder of her husband, Zenobia herself filled the vacant throne, and, with the most manly counsel, governed Palmyra, Syria, and the East for five years. The Roman Senate for a time in vain attempted to curb her power; she repulsed their General, and sent him back to Rome alike denuded of his army and his fame. Arabia, Arminia, and Persia, solicited her alliance. To the dominions of her husband by her prudence she added the populous and fertile kingdom of Egypt.

But the Emperor Aurelian with an immense army invaded Asia, and decided the fortunes of the Queen of the East in two hard fought battles. Besieged at last in her own beautiful city of Palmyra, renowned for its splendid temples, palaces, and porticoes of Grecian architecture, she was compelled to yield, not by capitulation, but by flight—she was carried to Rome a splendid trophy of Aurelian's good fortune and valor. On entering the city, as Gibbon relates, "the beauteous figure of Zenobia wss confined by fetters of gold, a slave supported the gold chain which encircled her neck, and she almost fainted under the intolerable weight of jewels. She preceded on foot the magnificent chariot in which she once hoped victoriously to have entered the gates of Rome." So fades the glory of this world. She was, indeed, treated honorably by the Emperor, who, because of his admiration of her splendid talents and public virtues, presented her with a beautiful villa on the bank of the Tiber, about twenty miles from Rome, where the Syrian Queen insensibly sunk into a Roman matron. Her daughters married into noble families, and her race continued till the fifth century.

But what shall I say of the illustrious women of modern Europe, whose noble deeds, whose splendid follies, whose heroic achievements, whose mighty genius, or whose public virtues have thrown a lustre on almost all the principal kingdoms of Europe? Time would fail me

to tell of Margaret, Queen of Denmark, the Semiramis of the North, mistress of three kingdoms—of Margaret of Valois, mother of Henry IV., an authoress, a poetess, a Queen—of another Margaret, mother of Henry VII., a patroness of learning, a founder of two colleges, although allied and related to thirty Kings and Queens, she spent her leisure hours not in courtly pastimes, but in translating from the French such pious books as Kempis on imitating Christ—of Maria Theresa, Empress Queen of Hungary, daughter of Charles VI., whose brilliant achievements and whose varied fortunes astonished Europe for forty years—of her daughter Maria Antoinette, Archduchess of Austria and Queen of France, wife of the unfortunate Louis. Voluptuous and criminal, her prodigality and bad counsels opposing the convocation of the States, terminated in her own ruin and in that of her husband King, and precipitated the reign of terror—the triumph of Atheism in France.

I again repeat, time would fail me to tell of the Catharines of France and Russia—the Elizabeths, the Marys, the Annes of England, and a thousand other noble and illustrious names. But I will be asked, Why enumerate so many of regal dignity, of high and elevated place, of illustrious fortune in exemplifying the power of woman? Because, I answer, amongst these we have the best educated of the sex—those invested with the most ample means of showing off to advantage the leading attributes of female character, and those whose deeds are best known in human history. How much more familiar to the million is Josephine, Maria Louisa, Ann Boleyn, Joan of Arc, Lady Jane Gray, and the present Victoria, than females of less conspicuous station?

To know the force of character of any individual, he must be placed in a position on a theatre where he has room to act his part fully. Few persons ever know themselves or their most intimate friends and relatives, because of the want of opportunity of developing themselves. If a prophet foretold our future exploits, more than Hazael would exclaim, "Is thy servant a dog, that he should do such a deed!" One reflection forces itself upon us while these premises are present. Had the females above named enjoyed as much *moral* as intellectual culture, and been as much under the government of the moral sentiments, as they were under the control of animal passions, how different from what it now is, might have been the fortunes and the character of the world at this hour!

But there are four aspects which I shall henceforth call *the four cardinal points* of woman, in which she must be contemplated before her all-controlling influence in society can be duly appreciated, espe-

ally her power of doing good. There is no need now-a-days to talk of her talents, nor of her susceptibilities of the most polished intellectual and moral culture. These are no longer matters of doubtful disputation. Notwithstanding the defects in her education, (and, till recently, they were neither few nor small,) she has not merely occasionally, but in fact often, astonished, dazzled, delighted us with the rich and varied resources of her genius, the splendid efforts of her understanding—the finished productions of her taste. She has gathered laurels on Mount Parnassus and wreaths of flowers on Mount Helicon. She has sat in the cells of the philosophers, and walked in the groves of the academies, and strewed all her paths with flowers of the sweetest odors and of the most beauteous tints.

We need not go back to the days of Aspasia whose genius in poetry and romance, Socrates himself, with all his philosophic gravity, could not but admire; nor to the time of Sappho, the poetess of Mytellene, almost coeval with Rome, whose delicious effusions and richly varied odes obtained for her the honors of the tenth muse. Nor need we call up the memory of Corinna and her fifty books of epigrams, to show what gifts Pallas, Apollo, and Mercury have bestowed on woman. Our own times, alike removed from the ages of superstition and romance, furnish clearer, more striking, richer and more varied examples, not merely of her power to attain to eminence, but of her eminent attainments in general literature, science, and in the fine arts of poetry, music, painting, and of living well.

I need not speak of the celebrity of Miss Edgeworth, as a writer of moral tales; of Miss Bailie as a tragedian; of Madame Stael as a miscellaneous writer of much wit and vivacity; of Miss Martineau as a tourist; of Mrs. Bowdler as a moralist; and of Miss Sedwick as a moral instructor. These are not our best models of female excellence even in the didactic art. Nor need I refer to the celebrity of Mrs. Hemans, now commensurate with English literature; nor to that of Mrs. Sigourney, commensurate with our own; nor to the miscellaneous and moral productions of Mrs. Hannah Moore, or Miss Beecher, all excellent in their kind. These are becoming as familiar in our country as weekly visitors or household words. They, indeed, are all honorable vouchers of what woman might be under a more philosophic, rational, and moral system of education; and, together with a thousand names of equal renown, show that the female mind only needs the proper appliances of good education to shine with a lustre, on a general scale, transcending far the humble standards fixed for it in ages, we hope, forever past.

But the four cardinal points in woman are quite of a different cate-

gory from that of talents and susceptibilities. These are the points of mighty influence from which she radiates her powers over the world. They are those of *daughter*, *sister*, *wife*, and *mother*. A woman is first a daughter—then a sister—then a wife—and then a mother; and under these potent and enchanting names she exercises all her transforming influence on human destiny.

As a *daughter*, she re-acts on her parents; she opens new springs of pleasures in their hearts, new hopes, new joys, new fears, which have a mystic influence over their characters; either in subduing their spirits to moral influences, or in stimulating their career in the paths of pride, avarice, and ambition.

As a *sister*, she either softens, subdues, mollifies, and polishes the manners of her brothers; or she excites them to deeds of chivalrous daring, to bold adventures in the ways of false pride, false shame, false honor. It has been sometimes observed by those who attend more philosophically to what passes under their observation, that it is always a misfortune to a brotherhood to have no sister in the family. Such persons are generally more rude, more awkward, more unpolished, more uncivilized in their modes and manners, than, all things else being equal, those fraternities are that enjoy the communion of sisters—

> "Whose company has harmonized mankind,
> Soften'd the rude and calm'd the boisterous mind."

As a *wife*, when properly educated, her power is not to be computed. The weaker vessel though she may be, in all that appertains to mere intellectual power; yet in the department of feeling, sensitiveness, promptness, decision, tenderness of affection, and self-denied devotion to her husband, she is generally his superior. Her counsels, if not uniformly infallible, are always sincere and cordial. Her motives can never be suspected, though her wisdom may; one, too, so intimately acquainted with his weak as well as his strong side, (for most husbands have two sides,) cannot fail to obtain incalculable ascendency. There is no covenant like the nuptial covenant—no copartnery like the oneness of the matrimonial contract. It is the identification of all the temporalities of two persons for life—an amalgamation of all natural interests, which places the parties in a position supremely to influence one another. But the recondite secret of a wife's power is only found in the superiority of her love. She conquers and reigns by love. Therefore, in the ratio of her affections, and her good sense must ever be her ascendency.

As a *mother*, however, her power is paramount. On that throne she is supreme. The whole world is in her hands, in her arms, in her bosom, while she is entrusted with the moulding of the soft clay

of humanity, and forming it after her own image. The discreet and affectionate mother lives forever in the heart of her children. They never can throw off all their allegiance to her, nor rise above her sovereign sway, if indeed she only knows how to wield that potent sceptre which the God of nature has put into her hands.

I believe there never was a man both good and great—that adorned with brilliant virtues our fallen race, that did not owe it to his mother. Her wisdom, her piety, her example, led him into the straight paths of true wisdom, goodness, and greatness, else his feet had not found them. So true it is, that if a child be brought up in the way that he should go, he will not in advanced years desert it, that it became a proverb in Israel three thousand years ago; and who can find in the annals of ancient or modern biography an exception to it, or a person of distinguished excellence who had not an excellent mother!

Ladies and gentlemen, this is just the point in which we can demonstrate woman's power to do good in society. I doubt not you were disappointed when I was instancing, by some names illustrious in history, her power of doing evil, that I did not at least balance the account by giving more bright examples of her power to bless and to do good. The reason you will soon discover, is, I was not then in the proper place to find such examples. Woman was not made to found cities and empires, to command armies and navies, to enter the arena of political strife, to figure in camps, in tilts and tournaments, to mingle in the intrigues and cabals of kings and courts. She was made for other ends, to move in other circles, and to exert an influence more pure, more powerful, more lasting. She was made to have an empire in the heart of man, and to wield a mild and gracious sceptre over the moral destinies of our race. Hence the domestic circle is the area of which she is the power, the light, the life, the glory. But though this circle be small, it has a paramount sway over every other circle in which man lives and moves. Hence the family institution gives laws to the school, the college, the university, the church, the state, the world. And so it comes to pass that woman's power is confined within this narrow circle that it might be the more concentrated and rebound with more force on all the interests of humanity.

And here while we have the four cardinal points of woman's true and proper sphere before us, and are dwelling on the last and paramount of these, her power as a *mother*, it will not be difficult or tedious to demonstrate her illimitable power of doing good. The giving to the world a Moses, a Samuel, a David, a Josiah, a Luther, a Franklin, a Washington, is doing more than did all the Pharaohs, the Ptolemies, the Alexanders, the Cesars, the Gregories, the Bourbons, the Tudors,

the Stewarts, the Hanoverians, the Guelphs, the Napoleons that ever lived. There is no power in numbers nor in mathematics to compute the amount of good effected by a Luther or a Washington. Not Saxony only, but Germany, Switzerland, Holland, England, Europe, America, the world, temporally, spiritually, and eternally, have been advantaged by the deeds of this immortal man. The annals of eternity alone can unfold all the good effects of the life of that reformer. And yet a single bias given by his mother, may have been, and doubtless was the fountain, the mainspring of all this incalculable series of advantages to our race! Is not the mother of our own Washington the root and origin of all the blessings, civil and social, accruing to this country, and to the human race for an indefinite series of ages? When, like the pious Hannah, a mother undertakes to train a child for the Lord and the human race, and brings him up in the tabernacles of piety, she aims at a power of doing good that reaches far beyond the land-marks of time—she may anoint the head and the heart of more kings than did the son of Hannah, and with a holier and more fragrant oil than that which from the Prophet's horn was poured upon the head of Saul, or on that of the son of Jesse. There is no decree which saith to woman's sway, either as a daughter, a sister, a wife, or a mother, as God has spoken to the waves of the sea, 'Hitherto shalt thou come and no farther, and here let all thy efforts be stayed.' No, thank Heaven's Eternal King, there is no limit set to her power. It may be temporal, spiritual, eternal. If woman has vanquished Samson the strongest of men, Solomon the wisest of men, and Adam the greatest of men, she has been made the mother of the *Saviour of men*, and may, through the religion of her Son, and of her Lord, exert a transcendent power over the destiny of man. She may bless a family, a nation, a generation, a world—not only for a jubilee, an age, a few centuries; but for ever and for ever.

But I said something of the Bible in her heart and in her hand, as next to her, or in conjunction with her, the mightiest and best means of civilizing, refining, elevating, and ennobling human nature. I presume so much upon the intelligence and good taste of my audience, as not to have allotted much space or time to the elucidation of this poin.

It is certainly well known to you, ladies and gentlemen, that women are more susceptible of religious impressions than men. All classic, all Pagan, all political, all sacred history, may be appealed to in proof that female piety is larger in quantity as well as of a finer quality than that of man. Woman figures more eminently in all the walks of piety in New Testament history. Not only in the days of the Christian Chief were women most ardent in their attachment to him, more

devoted in all their attentions to him, waiting upon his person, ministering to his wants—"last at the cross and earliest at his grave;" but after his resurrection they rallied in greater numbers to his cause, embraced it with warmer affections, endured persecution with greater constancy, often courting rather than shunning the pains of martyrdom. There is every where at this moment a preponderating amount of female devotion, and a very striking numerical superiority of female communicants at all the altars in our land.

The reason of this is found in the superior sensitiveness of woman—in the delicacy of all her susceptibilities of moral influence—and in her seclusion from the corrupting influence, the collision, the revelries, and jarring interests of a commercial, political, and worldly spirit. As some one has very beautifully said, "The current of female existence runs more within the embankments of home," But home is the centre and the throne of the sanctities as well as of the charities of life. The duties of a mother or of the mistress of a family all tend to piety by warming and softening the intellect and the affections.—Women, therefore, are usually the appointed guardians of domestic religion. They are removed at a more salutary distance from the stirring business, from the ambitions that engross the heart of man and the passions that devour it, and the undeviating processes which fix upon it day by day a thicker and a thicker crust of icy selfishness.

Add to this, women need more of the comforts of religion, depend more upon its aid, confide more in its protection, and derive from it more of their real charms and loveliness than from any other source whatever. A pious lady, well educated, and none are well educated that are not pious, that do not fear God and keep his commandments, has a power above every other female of the same circumstances, of the same personal accomplishments, not only over the good and excellent, but even over the irreligious themselves. Many irreligious, and even profane men, cannot love a woman without religion. When they think of marrying, they always think of a pure, and virtuous, and religious woman. Such only they regard as a crown of glory and honor; and only under the presidency of such a wife, and mother, and mistress of a house would they dare to commit the destinies of a family. It is, indeed, a noble testimony to religion, that not only good men, but bad men themselves, acknowledge its excellency and prefer an alliance with its friends rather than with those who are destitute of its ornaments and guardianship, or opposed to its purity and power.

Religion is, then, the true dignity of woman. The Bible in her heart, on her lips, and in her hand, imparts to her an excellency, a majesty, and a power that renders her the most efficient of all the

agencies in the universe, to improve, to civilize, and bless the world with the highest moral excellence, with the most refined and exalted social pleasures of which our species is susceptible in this state of trial and discipline.

I have said *the Bible in her heart*, and have I exaggerated the influence of that wonderful volume when inscribed upon the female heart! This I presume to be impossible. There is no hyperbole here. That book widens, deepens, enlarges, strengthens, and elevates the intellectual and moral capacities of human nature, of the male and female mind, above all other books, and sciences, and arts ever taught man or woman. The *fact* is one thing, and the philosophy of it another. But so clear is the evidence of the fact, that the destiny of a nation might be staked upon it. Let two females of equal natural development, of equal capacity for mental and moral improvement be selected: let one of them have the Alexandrian or London library at her command, *without the Bible;* and the other *the Bible only;* and let each of them devote for any definite number of years so many hours, daily, to reading and reflection. She who makes the Bible her choice will as certainly excel the other in all the points of which we now speak, as the Bible itself excels all other books in the world: provided only, that she read it without prejudice, and subject to the same canons of interpretation to which all other books of distant ages and countries are to be subordinated.

We have now no time on hand to eulogize the book of God; nor is it necessary to this audience. It is a very common theme. It is, however, a noble—a sublime one. It might well occupy the talents of an angel—the descriptive powers of a cherub. It is the book of the Divine nature; it is, indeed, the book of God—and the book of man. Other books have nations or individual men, or specific sciences or arts for their subject; this is the book of man. Human nature is here as fully revealed as the Divine. They are revealed in comparison, in contrast, in things similar, in things dissimilar. The fountains of the great deep of human thought, of human motives, of human action are broken up; and man, inward and outward, is contemplated not in the dim taper light of time, but in the strong bright light of eternity; not merely as respects his position on the terraqueous globe, nor in human society, but as respects all his positions and attributes in a whole universe, a [redacted] future, a vast eternity. The *speaker* is God; the *hearer*, man; the *subject*, human nature, human relations, human destiny; the *object*, eternal life, immortal glory.

The divine mind, the eternal Spirit breathes through the signs of that books—through its words, its types, its figures, its principles, its

precepts, its examples upon our moral nature. It quickens, animates, purifies, enlarges, elevates, and dignifies it by an assimilation of it to an incarnation of the Divinity itself; and capacitates man and woman for higher joys, purer delights, and a more efficient agency in imparting bliss to others, than all the documents, volumes, facts, and events in all the other records of man, or developments of God visible to mortal eye. But I said I intended neither comment nor encomium on the Bible, I therefore hasten to the capital and closing point of my address.

Society is not yet fully civilized. It is only beginning to be. Things are in process, in progress to another age—a golden—a millennial—a blissful period in human history. Selfishness, violence, inordinate ambition, revenge, duelling, even tyranny, oppression, and cruelty are yet exerting a pernicious influence in society. These are the real drawbacks on human happiness—the loud calls on genuine philanthropy. Woman I believe is destined to be the great agent in this grandest of all human enterprizes—an effort to advance society to the acme of its most glorious destiny on earth.

Already she exerts a great influence in all works of benevolence. In the visiting societies, in quest of the destitute, the sick, the wounded, the miserable: in the labors of the Sunday School—in the active and constant charities of the Christian church, her reputation is commensurate with the institutions themselves, and her influence is universally acknowledged. These, too, are acts of eternal renown. The great benefactor gave a fame lasting as time and the human race to the sister of Martha for such an act of love. Such ladies as Mrs. Chaupone, Mrs. Trimmer, Mrs. Carter, Mrs. Barbauld, Mrs. Hannah Moore, Mrs. Hemans, &c., have an extensive fame and an extensive usefulness; but the space which they occupy is but a speck compared with that filled with the Mary that anointed the Lord for his sepulture. The labors of Mrs. Fry, or of the Sisters of Charity, are not those of genius, poetry, imagination, but of genuine benevolence. It is not the shedding of a few sympathetic tears over some high-wrought imagitive tale of woe, found in books of fiction, in the volumes of romance, but the pouring of the oil and the wine, the genuine tears of benevolence, into the real wounds of the sons and daughters of anguish, that is inscribed in the book of Heaven's heraldry, and to be divulged in celestial ears with angelic admiration an[illegible]

But we ask, because we expect, more than this. We ask for a female cordon to stretch through the whole length of this land, against the appalling progress of fashionable vices, not merely against the luxurious extravagances of costly raiment, splendid furniture, and

sumptuous modes of living, which in themselves are great evils, and fast precipitating this nation against that fatal rock on which the proudest empires have been dashed to pieces; but against the remains of barbarism still existing amongst us—duelling, revenge, violence, oppression, &c.

Am I interrogated on what I mean by a female cordon? I answer, that all ladies of education, of elevated standing, of moral excellence, shall, with one consent, frown from their presence those who delight in such deeds—who either perpetrate them, or take pleasure in those that do them; that they show a profound veneration for the philanthropic Author of our religion, who has peremptorily and on pain of eternal ruin, forbade all malice, violence, revenge, cruelty, murder, and oppression.

They can do more than all legislative enactments, than all human codes and punishments, to exterminate these horrible remains of savage paganism, so incongruous with the doctrine and principles of the *Prince of Peace*. Was it, for example, to be known and depended upon, as certain as death, that every one concerned in a duel was to be enrolled as a coward—as one that feared a whimsical, imaginative, unwritten, unintelligible code of honor, more than the laws of the eternal God—as one that dreaded the scorn of the wicked more than the scorn of all in the heavens, was to be debarred the company of ladies, and to be excluded from the participation of their smiles, I am confident that we should never again hear of a single rencounter of the sort, that the soil of such a community would not again be polluted by the tread of one that in time of peace had passionately, revengefully, and recklessly shed the blood of his brother.

But before such consolidated virtue can be warrantably hoped for, the standard of female education must be greatly elevated and improved. Incomparably more attention, than at present, must be paid to the training and development of the moral sentiments. The *heart*, rather than the *head;* the *affections*, rather than the *intellect*, must be the centre of the whole circle of education, on which must operate all the scholastic forces from the lessons of the nursery up to those of the sage philosopher. The dignity of human nature, its sublime origin, its godlike organization, its magnificent and glorious destiny, its mysterious and spiritual relations to an immense universe, to high orders of intelligences, to the principalities, authorities, and hierarchies of the heavens must be standing topics in the every day bill of intellectual and moral fare, from the abecedarian up to the seniors of the highest school in the land.

Every subject, every object of thought in all the regions of mind and

matter, in literature, science, and art, must be laid under tribute to religion and morality. If there be design, utility, beauty, loveliness apparent in any thing, it must be traced up to the eternal source of all wisdom, goodness, beauty, and loveliness, and made a text to show forth his infinite excellencies to the opening genius of the youthful inquirer. Every thing must be taught and learned in all its connexions with the being, perfections, and designs of the Creator. The archetypes of the universe must be found in his infinite and eternal intelligence, and every beauty, melody, and harmony in nature and society, must be made to engage the affections more and more to him—"Him first, him last, him midst, and without end;" all nature, science, art, and learning must be made to reveal and extol. This course will, under the dews, the rains, and the sunshine of heavenly and divine influence, secure the heart to all that is good, and honorable, and excellent in earth and heaven.

Finally, ladies and gentlemen, be it remembered that it is only when woman is viewed in her first cardinal point, that she is within the circle of direct didactic influence. It is only as a *daughter* that she is immediately under parental education and discipline. She must, while only sustaining this position to the family, be made to comprehend all that is indicated in that very dear and interesting title. But for our consolation it ought to be distinctly and emphatically stated, that when a daughter is so trained and educated as to understand all that is implied in filling up the whole measure of the duties of a daughter, she is an accomplished sister, will make a good wife, an excellent mother. A good daughter must inevitably be a good sister, a good wife, a good mother. If, then, proper care be taken of our daughters, and their education be conducted on rational and moral principles, no person need fear to endorse for the reputation, excellency and moral worth of the sister, the wife, or the mother.

Who is it, then, who desires a deep and more thorough reformation of public manners and customs; or who is it that seeks for social pleasures of the highest earthly order, and would advance the amelioration of the social state to the highest point within the grasp of rational or religious anticipation? Let him turn his attention to more rational, scientific, liberal, and moral education of woman. Let him bear in mind that she must take the precedence as the most puissant leader in every work of moral reform in society. Hers is the delightful task, as well as the sovereign power to mould human nature after a divine model. She sows the seed, she plants the germs of human goodness and human greatness. She infixes the generous purpose, the salutary and noble principles in the youthful heart. She makes the men and

women of future times, and shapes the character and destinies of posterity even to the third, and to the fourth, and sometimes to the tenth generation. Ought not, then, every patriot, every philanthropist, every good citizen, every Christian in the land to rally all his forces, to summon all his energies, to co-operate in the great cause of female education. It is not the education of the daughters of the affluent and honorable only, or chiefly, of which we speak—it is the education of all—it is common, it is universal female education, and to a more liberal extent than has yet been imagined, for which we speak, when we plead for that female education indispensable to the full and proper amelioration of the social state.

Individual, family, or national wealth never can be more advantageously appropriated, than in the mental and moral education of all the sons and daughters of the State. We owe it, then, to ourselves, to our children, to our country, to the world, to bestir ourselves in this most useful, honorable, and beneficent of mortal undertakings. Let us, then, awaken to our responsibilities, and to our power of blessing others, and of being blessed, and place our energies and our influence along with our other means, on the side of woman's high advancement in all the paths of literature and science, of religion and morality.—Then must we greatly enhance and sweeten the charms of home—of the social hearth—the domestic circle—the city—the church—the world. Then may we anticipate a day of richer blessings, of purer pleasures, of more lasting joys to the human race; and, on the well-fledged wings of vigorous and healthful hope, we may glide down the whole vista of time, to those eternal scenes of holier delight, of more refined ecstacy, which fill the raptured vision of the saint, in those climes of eternal peace and social bliss, where every eye is filled with uncreated light, and every heart with love.

EXTRACT FROM AN ADDRESS

On the subject of Common School Education, by Doctor WYLIE, D. D., *in Indianapolis, Ia., June* 3, 1837.

THE idea of a Supreme Being, the Maker and Lord of all, though incomprehensible even by the wisest philosopher, may be apprehended readily by a child, which, as soon as it looks abroad on the wonders of creation, may be taught to discern manifestations of the Creator's power, wisdom, and goodness. The contemplation of these divine attributes naturally awakens the moral feelings. Such is the eagerness of children to know the causes and reason of things, that one can hardly

avoid teaching them something on such subjects. The elementary truths of religion are so plain that no great reach of thought is requisite to perceive them. As the child grows up to manhood the manifold influences which come upon his maturer mind from an evil world do more, perhaps, to obscure his view of them, than his increased power of intellect does to render them plain. The alphabet of piety is easier than the alphabet of letters. The one belongs to the language of nature, and has an interpreter in every bosom; the other is conventional and artificial, and a variety of abstractions must be made before it can be understood. The child in the cradle knows the meaning of looks and tones by a kind of intuition, which the experience of after life scarcely renders more perfect. And it is by a language of the same kind that the Author of nature speaks to his rational offspring. How important that the divine voice reach the youthful heart before it becomes hardened and estranged by the voices, and cares, and pleasures of after life. And how happy would it be for many whose feelings have become alienated from God and religion by worldly pursuits and a false philosophy, if they could reverse the course of their experience, and become "as little children" again. There is, in the character of every *eminently* good man, an affectionate sweetness of temper, not to be soured by injury—a simplicity which seeks no disguise, a charity which "thinketh no evil," and a fearlessness in the discharge of duty. These carry with them the charm of a childlike purity and innocence, and they spring from no other root but piety. Let this, then, be instilled into the mind before the acetous fermentation takes place among the passions, and it will preserve the soul in its infantine sweetness. But by no instrumentality can this be so well effected as by that of a mother's love. A mother's love, and the spirit of piety! O, they are the sweetest, purest, brightest, mightiest of those messengers which God commissions and sends to accomplish his purposes of mercy here on earth; and if any thing can, surely their united influence must win the wayward soul of man for that happy world whence they descended. The wretch who has had their sweet influence, like the breath of heaven, shed over his childhood, and who has made himself strong enough to overcome it, is a reprobate, abandoned, doomed, accursed of God. I have never yet seen such a man, and I would hope no such instance of depravity can be found. On the other hand I may ask, confident of a favorable answer from a thousand grateful tongues, Who has not been reclaimed from the verge of guilt, animated in the midst of danger, and supported in the hour of affliction by a mother's counsel, a mother's example, and a mother's prayers; and who, while bending in sad but fond recollection over a mother's tomb, has not sensibly felt the heavenward attraction of a mother's spirit, as his thoughts attempted to trace the path by which it soared away beyond mortal vision when it left the world?

Nor is the influence of sensible and pious woman confined to those who are placed by nature under their own particular charge. A deep but unostentatious sense of religion, added to the domestic virtues, imparts to the person and conduct of woman a grace and dignity which surpass all her other charms, and repel not merely from her presence, but from the circle of her influence, whatever is unseemly and improper.

We have, all of us, duties to discharge which respect the future.

Our circumstances are rapidly changing. As wealth increases our dangers as well as our advantages increase with it. The follies and vices of what is called fashionable life are migrating along with the tide of wealth and population, from the east towards the west. Should I disguise the fact that in these things the fair sex usually take the lead? Fashion, in some of our eastern cities, has already established her reign of terror, and set up her Juggernaut. She applies instruments of torture to the bodies of her victims; they are compressed into the form of a wasp, and thus deformed; heart and lungs and other vital organs literally crushed within them; they are compelled to drag out a miserable existence, devoid of every comfort. Physicians, moralists, philanthropists, and divines have remonstrated, and petitioned, and entreated, but in vain. The cruel power is inexorable. Now I know of no means of preventing her horrible dominion from extending over us, so likely to succeed, as by giving to our young females a pious education. Enlightened piety raises the mind and character of women above the frivolity and inanity, to the prevalence of which fashion, that bloody Moloch to which so many young lives are sacrificed, is indebted for all that influence which supports her cruel and remorseless reign. To escape with their rising families from under her dominion was the principal motive which induced some of us to migrate hither. But the attempt to fly was vain. The gilded banner of the fantastic power is borne after us. You may see it unfolded and floating on the breeze. Here we must resist or die. And, ladies, in this holy war you must lead the van!

A devotion to the theatre and the ball-room, with the frivolities of dress, and visiting, and gossipping, and a thousand other excesses which constitute the life and employment of fashionable people, are on all accounts to be condemned and deplored, but chiefly on account of their influence on the minds of the young, unsettling their moral principles, rendering them light and vain, devoid of energy, and open to every temptation. And, as the fair sex are the first to suffer the sad effects of fashionable dissipation, so their influence only can prevent it.

Let them, then, despising the life of a butterfly, aspire to what is great, and noble, and worthy their rational and immortal nature; let them consider their obligations and responsibilities, as beings entrusted by Heaven with an influence to be exerted in forming the character, and consequently deciding the fate of the rising generation; and let them be assured that their own personal happiness and the esteem of those of our sex, whose esteem is worthy their regard, will be secured and augmented in proportion to their fidelity to the high and important trust. Let every mother know, that by teaching her children piety towards God, she lays in their minds the surest foundation for another virtue, of which she herself is the beloved object—piety to parents: and let every daughter know that all men, who are not libertine in principle, honor and respect these virtues as the brightest ornaments of the sex. Let these things, I say, be well understood and zealously practised, and the result, as it respects common education, will be glorious and happy for them, every household through the land will become a school of virtue and a dwelling place of delight.

THOUGHTS ON EVIDENCE—*No. VII.*

THERE is no more common error than that of judging the whole from a part. No one likes to be long in a state of uncertainty; and it is also much easier to decide upon such evidence as presents itself readily, than to endure the labor of protracted investigation. This is one of the causes through which human testimony has become greatly undervalued. Finding it to be untrue in some cases, men have hastily concluded that it is uncertain in its very nature. But, with regard to the evidence of sense, self-love has reversed the rule. Men do not like to admit or to remember that they have been deceived by their own senses. It implies deficiency; and few are disposed to dwell upon their own imperfections, whether natural or accidental, mental or moral. They are careful rather to recollect that the reports of their senses are generally correct; and, when they have plausibly accounted to themselves for any occasional error, they are ready to believe them infallible. From what has been already said, however, it is obvious that the charge of uncertainty may be urged against both kinds of evidence, with equal propriety, from similar premises. If rules are to be reversed because there are some exceptions to them; and human testimony is to be regarded as uncertain because sometimes deceptive, so will it be with sensation. For it has been already shown that the reports of the senses are delusive and false in many cases; and always so under circumstances analogous to those by which the credibility of witnesses is affected; so that if interested motives or defective knowledge render the latter unworthy of credence, a diseased or imperfect condition of the senses will invalidate no less the evidence they supply.

Why should human testimony be in its nature uncertain? Men are by nature as much disposed to report truly as to perceive correctly. It is much more natural and easy to speak truth than to invent a lie. To falsify requires effort and the exercise of powers which will not be called into action without reason or motive. When children report falsely, it is, for the most part, because they are mistaken in their perceptions. Fear and wonder, ignorance and hate will, it is well known, affect the perception as well as the report; and while it is admitted that human testimony, abstractly considered, is sometimes false, there is good reason to believe that it is oftener relatively so from wrong perceptions. It has, however, become so fashionable to doubt human testimony, that it is almost certain to incur the blame in every instance. And there can be no doubt but that the case would

have been reversed if children had been as diligently taught to doubt the reports of the senses; to consider, compare, weigh maturely, and judge deliberately, before they could believe their eyes and ears. Were they accustomed to hear them spoken of as delusive, uncertain, and unworthy of credit without confirmation, and human testimony as incomparably superior, a similar prejudice would have been created against the former in favor of the latter, and the errors of human testimony would now be laid to the charge of sensation.

It may be said, again, that knowledge obtained directly through the senses, is instant, clear, and full; incapable of addition or improvement; and that it does not, like human testimony, require a mental exercise in the minute examination, comparison, and balancing of the different reports of witnesses. This cannot, however, be affirmed with truth of sensation and perception. There is and must be in every case an action of the mind. True, indeed, with regard to such objects as are familiar to us, we judge with so much rapidity that we are unconscious of any process of reasoning, or comparison. We perceive no interval between the sensation and the conviction. There is nevertheless an action of the mind in the comparison and judgment absolutely necessary to an acquaintance with, or identification of, the object presented to the senses. Attention, sensation, perception, comparison, and consciousness are all necessary before judgment can decide, and we can have no ideas or notions of things until we judge of them. This process is so rapid, as before stated, in the case of familiar objects, that we, for the most part, take no cognizance of it. But when any thing is presented which is new to us, how slow and careful we are in deciding respecting it! As though we knew our senses to be most delusive, we handle it again and again; we look at it most attentively; we repeatedly subject it to the action of other senses; we hesitate, compare, reason, reflect, and at length judge. Again, when an object is at a distance from us, as when we stand upon the shore of a lake or of the ocean, and perceive in the verge of the watery horizon something which appears as but a speck, with what exact scrutiny we observe it! How we strain the organs of vision in endeavors to discover its character! How uncertain we are! How wavering in our conclusions! We call upon memory for former experience, and as the object approaches change constantly our views of it. We are glad, too, on such an occasion to avail ourselves of the judgment and testimony of others. If we have a companion, we inquire what he thinks of it. Nay, if we suppose him to have more experience or to possess keener vision, we will even take his testimony, as in the case of optical illusion, in preference to the apparent

evidence of our own senses. It is in cases such as these where the mental machinery moves more slowly, that we are enabled to detect and distinguish the various parts of that process which must of necessity obtain in all cases.

The action of the mind, however, is precisely similar in regard to human testimony. When matters are related to us which are familiar, which perfectly accord with our past experience or our previous anticipations, we give instant and implicit credit to the relation, without noticing any accompanying operation of the mind in comparing and judging. Sensation and perception cannot be more rapid in many cases than relation and belief. But when things are reported which are novel to us, we proceed to weigh maturely and deliberately the evidence of their truth. Now it is worthy of remark that such things are far more frequently presented to us through human testimony than by the evidence of sense. We hear of a thousand things new to us, where we have the opportunity of seeing one. It is, indeed, the peculiar province of human testimony to *tell* NEWS. The circle of our own familiar observation is but a narrow one. Human testimony takes a wider range. And it is doubtless in a good degree owing to the fact that it does for the most part present matters which are new to us, and which require minute examination, and excite surprise, doubt, hesitancy, and deliberation, that it has been regarded not only as itself an uncertain species of evidence, but as requiring a peculiar and complicated action of the mind liable to error and uncertainty in the very nature of things. This uncertainty, it is now manifest, belongs not to the evidence, but to the objects which fall within its sphere. It is equally connected with similar objects in the case of sensation. So that if human testimony be in any case uncertain because it requires an action of the mind more or less rapid and complicated, sensation is no less so for the very same reason. R. R.

PROPHETIC CALCULATION.

Curious coincidence of Calculation respecting the Fall of the Ottoman Power.

WALL observes that the Ottoman power began in 1300, or 1301. Constantinople was taken in 1453. If the date of 396 be reckoned from thence, the expiration will be in 1849.

But Wall is in an error in saying 396 instead of 391, the true prophetic period; subtract, therefore, five years, which brings to A. D. 1844.

Whitaker reckons from the 29th May, 1453, when Constantinople was taken, and speaks of the expulsion of the Ottoman from thence as

being likely to happen 391 years from that date; that is in June, 1844.

Thurston gave precisely the same interpretation, and expects a revival of the Eastern Roman Empire, by the assumption of the reins of government by a Christian power at Constantinople, in 1844.

In confirmation of this last view, if we compute the 2300, or, according to the Septuagint, 2400 days of Daniel, chap. viii. 14, from *the rise* of the Medo-Persian Empire, or from the *first battle* gained by Cyrus—viz. 526 B. C., it brings us down to the same year—1844.

Thus 1844 added to 556 equals 2400.

Frere reckons 2400 years from B. C. 553, being the third year of Belshazzar, king of Babylon, in which year Daniel's vision was seen; in which case, they terminate in 1847; at which time all nations professing the Mahometan religion will be brought into the church.

News from the Churches.

Hopkinsville, Kentucky, May 4, 1840.

It is always pleasing to hear of the success of *truth*. Our hearts have been made greatly to rejoice within a few days past, notwithstanding the vast amount of opposition to our views in this section of country. On Saturday the 25th ultimo, brother William Brown arrived here and commenced preaching the gospel to large and attentive congregations; and on Friday following brother Allen Kendrick, of Tennessee, came to his assistance. Since the meeting commenced eighteen persons have confessed, and been buried with their Lord in baptism. The meeting is still going on, and I think the prospect for more is very flattering. Doubtless there are many, like Agrippa, almost persuaded to be Christians. O Lord, revive thy work; in the midst of the years make known, in wrath remember mercy.

WILLIAM R. CHEW.

Brownsburg, Ind. April 8, 1840.

The good cause of the Lord is progressing here. Brother T. Lockhart is with us—preached two days—three confessed the good Lord and were baptized—two joined by letter. In a tour of seven or eight days he baptized eight persons before these

A. CALL.

Georgetown, Kentucky, May 28, 1840.

Our meeting at Harrodsburg closed on last Thursday. It was one of the most profitable and interesting that I ever attended. We were made to rejoice greatly by the addition of forty converts. The acquaintance which I formed with many choice spirits from different parts of the state, rendered the meeting doubly dear to me It was a state meeting, as you know; but it was very partially attended. It is confidently believed that not more than one third of our strength was reported The returns gave 10,000 members. I feel assured from my own knowledge and the information received from others, that our numbers would fall very little, if any, short of 30,000

The congregation at Harrodsburg, by the advice of the assembly of the saints are to appoint two evangelists, whose duty it will be to traverse the state and rouse the churches to a sense of their duties and responsibilities We shall have a meeting at the same place in 1841, the Lord willing, when the reports of the evangelists will exhibit the strength of the churches, their resources, their efforts, their numbers, and whether they are or not resolved to co-opernte and lend a helping hand in this great work of converting the world. A kindred feeling animated the body from first to last. Union, harmony, and love prevailed in all that was done.

May the Lord preserve and bless you in all your work of faith, labors of love, and patience of hope!

J. T. JOHNSON

Warren county, Illinois, May 25, 1840.

Since my last communication to you there have been eight or nine added to the congregations in the bounds of my labors, by immersion I have lately visited Quincey, in Adams county, where I met with brother Creath, of Missouri, who addressed the citizens of that place with great ability. Though none made the good confession from among the aliens, yet some united with us who were formerly Baptists—the wife of Governor Carlin and a sister Turner. We were assured that a favorable impression was made on many minds, and have reason to hope that the foundation has been laid for good to be done hereafter. Brother Johnson, Elder of the church on Bear Creek, informed me that eleven had been immersed in the bounds of his labors since last winter.

LIVY HATCHITT.

Wheeling, Virginia, June 5, 1840.

The Disciples had a fine meeting at Bellcair, Ohio, four miles below this place, commencing on last Saturday and ending on Monday evening following. Five were added to the number of disciples by being buried with Christ in baptism. Brother A. G. Ewing was there; also, brother Pool, from Steubenville; besides, a very fine old brother, from A. G's neighborhood. The people showed great attention, and I trust much good will be done there yet.

W. EWING.

Aurora, Portage county, Ohio, May 11, 1840.

We have had a protracted meeting at this place. The old gospel was proclaimed by brothers A. Bentley, W. Collins, C. Bosworth, M. S. Clapp, and A. B. Green, with some degree of success. Twenty-eight were immersed during the meeting; 6 two weeks before, and 2 yesterday; making in all, 37; some of them from the Presbyterian ranks: and if the church does her duty, many more, we trust, will be added soon.

Brother Campbell, do you expect to visit the Reserve this season? If you do, will you make your arrangements to spend one or two days at Aurora?

HENRY BALDWIN.

Greenfield, Illinois, May 5, 1840.

The good cause is still going on slowly in this country. At a two days' meeting, embracing the third Lord's day in April, I had the pleasure of introducing five into the gracious kingdom. Blessed be the name of the Lord!

R. GARRETT.

Mount Sterling, Kentucky, April 5, 1840.

I sit down to communicate to you what the Lord has done for us, and he is not withholding his power from us at this time. We have had a great revival in Mount Sterling. Several of the most distinguished characters of our town and county have confessed the Lord. I will just name some of them—Hon. Richard French, who is a candidate for Governor of Kentucky; George Howard, one of the oldest settlers of this place—his hairs have been bleached with the frosts of sixty winters, but he has at length seen the need of a Saviour, and has taken upon him the yoke of the Lord. Also, Mr. Peter Everitt and his brother Samuel went up and made the good confession. Even the most wicked have turned their feet to the paths of the Lord: Joseph Irvin and Jackson Campbell, both of whom have led lives of the most degrading wickedness, have submitted themselves to the Lord. During our meeting one of the most distinguished Methodist ministers came out boldly, and confessed that he had been blinded ever since he made a profession. His eyes are now open, and can now see the strait path. His name is J. W. Riggin. Three or four of the most distinguished members of the Presbyterian church have also joined us. Brothers William Saddler and J. Horne were our laboring ministers during this meeting.

J. P. R. OVERALL.

Greenup county, Kentucky, March 1, 1840.

The disciples in this vicinity have a desire through the Harbinger to inform the holy brethren, their fellow-sufferers in the patience and kingdom of Jesus Christ, of the holy triumphs of truth in the year 1839. In order that you may form some just idea of the obligations we are under to bless and praise the God of mercy and truth, we inform you that this end of the earth eighteen months ago, with a small, very small exception, seemed to say, like the Jewish Sanhedrim, "Speak no more in this name." A sectarian delusion as strange and full as direful as Salem witchcraft, spread darkness on the earth, and gross Egyptian darkness upon the people thereof.

The Baptists went so far as to cast out of their synagogues any one who might dare to read the Harbinger, or hear a sermon from one of us, who had boldness enough to announce to the world remission of sins through the name of Jesus Christ, unaided by the fooleries of self and Calvin, falsely called an experience of grace. Nearly a similar course was pursued by all the sectaries. Worse than all, the very providence of God seemed to say, These unholy, unsanctified beings, like Ephraim of old, "are joined to their idols—(creeds)—let them alone." I mean no disposition seemed to be manifested by Evangelists from more favored places to visit us. But, glory to God and Jesus Christ, in the very midst of Babylon there seems to be an alarm—a fervent holy desire to get out. A congregation of ninety members has been constituted on the state road. Brothers Ashley, Mitchel, and Marshall have recently welcomed a goodly number into the kingdom of heaven, who formerly lived in that street of the great city called Methodist Episcopal, and backed out one of her principal merchants, who, on account of his age or some extraordinary qualification to wholesale or retail the delicacies of the harlot city as the true riches, was called Elder. Within two months past brother D. Dillon has welcomed ninety-three into the church of Christ; sixty of whom came (to use the impressive words of one of the happy number) post-haste out of the city devoted to destruction. The entire increase in the year 1839 is one hundred and ninety-eight. I would mention in addition the names of my dear brethren A. Sanders and Joel Cook, who labor among us. But as my object is not to do justice to the abilities of the Evangelists who have visited us, (may kind Jesus bless them, all,) but simply to tell the triumph of truth; we give all the glory to God and the Lamb, but feel a large amount of gratitude to all his instruments. Therefore, dear brother, you have a place in our hearts, and an interest in our prayers, because of your labor of love among us.

WILLIAM E. MAVITY.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

NEW SERIES.

VOLUME IV.——NUMBER VIII.

BETHANY, VA. *AUGUST*, 1840.

FAITH ALONE.

JAMESTOWN, Ohio, June 4th, 1840.

Dear brother Campbell,

MANY have tried to prove that remission of sins is by faith alone; and now suppose you allow me to try, and see whether I can succeed any better than my predecessors.

I am fully aware that unless I get the assistance of an Apostle I shall fail. I will therefore call on Paul, and see what he will say.

Paul speaks thus "Although we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more;" besides, "We know that whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord; therefore, we walk by faith, not by sight" In the above the Apostle clearly affirms that nothing in religion is matter of knowledge, but that all is matter of faith to men in the flesh. Therefore no man knows that his sins are forgiven, because in the absence of Christ he has not heard him say so: but the Apostles have testified that Christ did promise to forgive men their sins on certain conditions. Therefore, when the conditions are complied with on our part, it is by faith that we receive and enjoy remission, and not by sight, nor by hearing, nor by feeling, nor by tasting, nor by smelling, nor by repentance, nor by baptism, nor by prayer; for repentance, baptism, and prayer are nothing more than actions resulting from faith; neither of them can take hold of a promise, but faith can; and therefore it is by *faith alone* that men in the flesh receive and enjoy the remission of sins. God, Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, remission of sins, and eternal life, all dwell in our minds and hearts by faith, and by faith only; for not a man in the universe knows any thing about God, or Jesus Christ, or the Holy Spirit, or the remission of sins, or eternal life, but by the belief of testimony, which is faith. Therefore it is evident that remission of sins, and every thing else in religion, is received and enjoyed by faith, while we remain in the flesh; "for we walk by faith, and not by sight," or knowledge. I shall now leave you to judge whether, by the help of Paul, I have proved my position or not.

Affectionately yours, W. WINANS.

P. S. Every condition must be complied with before faith is perfected; for faith cannot take hold of a promise until the condition on which that promise is predicated is performed; therefore, faith is perfected by works. M. W.

ANIMADVERSIONS ON THE ABOVE.

Brother Winans,

In attending to son Alexander's business in his absence, your letter of the 4th instant came to hand; and I must say, I feel much gratified with the lucid and masterly manner in which you have proved your position; for proved it I think you have.—Not, indeed, that we are *saved* by *faith alone*, as some appear to understand it; but only that we are *justified* by *faith alone;* for justification is but the one half; yea, but the commencement of our present salvation; for "without holiness no man shall see the Lord." Now holiness is the result of unlimited obedience: see 1 Peter i. 22. "Having purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit;—to unfeigned love of the brethren;—"love one another with pure hearts fervently" The truth is, we are justified by the blood of Christ. Rom. v. 9. Through faith, in it. iii. 25., and sanctified through his Spirit by a continued course of humble self-denying obedience. Rom. viii. 9—14. "Now if any man have not the spirit of Christ he is none of his." And, "As many as are led by the spirit of God, they are the sons of God." So that we are saved through faith and obedience; or through the obedience of faith. Rom. xvi. 26. That is, the obedience that proceeds from it. For faith is the principle of all true and acceptable obedience; "for without faith it is impossible to please God." Heb. xi. 6.—Impossible to know any thing at all about him, as you have well shown in your letter. And, indeed, quite as impossible to be justified by any thing else, because it is by promise; "for God gave it to Abraham by promise." "And not being weak in faith, he staggered not at the promise through unbelief: but was strong in faith, giving glory to God:—therefore, it was imputed to him for righteousness. Now, it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed him; but for us also to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification." Moreover, as to the enjoyment of justification, or being actually justified, it is all the same, whether the promise, by the belief of which we are justified, be conditional or unconditional; for still it is the belief of the promise alone, and not the performance of the condition, that actually justifies: for even suppose the condition was actually fulfilled, and the promise not believed, the performer would not be actually justified;—would not "have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ" Now this is the proper and immediate effect of the justification of which the Apostle treats, Romans 3d, 4th, and 5th chapters; as also in his Epistle to the Galatians, chapters 3d, 4th, and 5th; exhorting us to stand fast in this blissful liberty, wherewith Christ has made us free.—Consequently, it must be by *faith alone.*

Nevertheless, it appears to me that you have somewhat embarrassed your position by the following concessions, viz. "That the Apostles have testified that Christ did promise to forgive men their sins upon certain conditions. Therefore, when the conditions are complied with on our part, it is by faith that we receive and enjoy remission: for faith cannot take hold of a promise, until the condition, on which that promise is predicated, is performed; therefore, faith is perfected by works" Now does not this appear like necessarily connecting faith and works in the article of justification, or in order to the enjoyment of remission? I am aware, however, that this is not your intention;—that you only mean baptism, which, with respect to the recipients or subjects, is no where called a work, neither indeed can be, whatever it might be called with respect to the baptizer, who performs the action. And even suppose we should consider it as a condition of the enjoyment of remission, yet that would, by no means, justly entitle it to be called a work, any more than a naked man's accepting and putting on a coat freely offered him, could be legally so called. And, indeed, is not this expressly the scripture phraseology respecting

the connexion of a believer's baptism with the enjoyment of Christ our righteousness? For, saith the Apostle, "As many of you as have been baptised into Christ, have *put on Christ.*" Gal. iii, 27. The believer's baptism, then, in the name of Jesus Christ, is the formal constitutional expression of his faith in Christ for all the promised blessings of salvation, which are all comprehensively contained in the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit;—the former, for justification from the penalty,—the latter, for deliverance from the practice of sin;—the former, by virtue of the blood of Christ, through faith; the latter, by virtue of the Holy Spirit, through obedience.

I am also aware, however, that many connect repentance, i. e. reformation with baptism as an indispensable condition of remission. Indeed, were this so, not only a cessation from all evil, but also a constant performance of all good works, would be previously necessary, not only to remission, but even to baptism itself; which, if carried out to its proper ultimate, would necessarily lead the believer, with some of old, to postpone his baptism to the very last, that so he might receive the full remission of all his sins. But those of old that did so, were led to think that sins committed after baptism were unpardonable; whereas, those who at present connect repentance with baptism, as a previous condition of remission, do so from the order of the words in the text, merely because it precedes baptism, Acts ii. 38; not duly considering the state of the case:—that the querists were already believing penitent sinners, and therefore the fit subjects for baptism; and also that the import of their inquiry,—what they should do to be saved from the justly apprehended dreadful consequences of their guilt, in crucifying the Lord of glory, both demanded and received a complete answer, as is fully comprehended in the words of the Apostle;—presenting them with the blissful promise of the "remission of their sins," and of "the gift of the Holy Spirit," through baptism; thus virtually presenting them with a complete salvation.—Also, not duly considering, that both in thinking and speaking the end commonly precedes the means; thus we say, be sober and quit drinking, &c. &c. Now sobriety is the end, and ceasing to drink—the means: according to the old adage, "What is first in intention is last in execution." Wherefore *reformation*—the grand intention of faith, repentance, and baptism; yea, even of the gift of pardon and of the Holy Spirit, is put foremost in the Apostle's answer to the believing penitents.—"Reform, said he, and be immersed," &c.

Besides we are divinely informed, "that it is by faith, that it might be by grace, that the promise might be sure to all the seed, Rom. iv. 16;—not of works, lest any man should boast;" therefore it cannot be conditional: and even faith itself is but the principle of enjoyment;—not the means of procurement.

Moreover, how can the unholy, unjustified, unsanctified sinner do any thing religiously good? "For the heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked." Jer. xviii. 9 And "the old man is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts." Eph iv. 22. Now "who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one." Job xiv. 4. These things being so, it necessarily follows, that justification must be received and enjoyed by *faith alone;* being already procured by the *blood* of Christ *alone.* And seeing also, that even baptism itself, the proximate means of the enjoyment of remission, does not belong to the catalogue of good works; but merely symbolizes a birth, a burial, and a washing: the first of which is prior, and the second posterior, to all works of any kind; and as to the third, the subject is passive, as were the disciples, when Christ washed their feet. Therefore the enjoyment of justification has nothing to do with conditional works of any kind; but merely with *faith alone;* by which *alone,* in this life, we can enjoy it; and to which *primarily* and *alone* the promise is made: for he that believeth *is justified from all things:* Acts xiii. 39. Through faith in the blood of Christ. Rom. iii 25.

But is it not written, James ii. 21, 24., "Was not Abraham our father justified by works when he had offered his son Isaac upon the altar? You see, then, how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." True, but not from his sins; for it is not about this that the Apostle is speaking, but merely with respect to his character and claims as a professed believer: see verse 14—"What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man *say* he hath faith, and have not works; can faith save him?" Surely no; such a faith can save

no man. But not so true justifying saving faith; for "it works by love and purifies the heart." "For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision nor uncircumcision availeth any thing, but faith that works by love." Upon the whole, it appears demonstrably evident, that as the enjoyment of justification in this life is by promise, it must necessarily therefore be by *faith alone;* seeing it is *faith alone*, and nothing else, that can realize and enjoy a promise, whether conditional or unconditional.

Yours, dear brother, very respectfully,

THOMAS CAMPBELL.

FAMILY EDUCATION.

THE NURSERY.

"THE man Elkanah, and all his house, went up to offer to the Lord the yearly sacrifice, and his vow. But Hannah went not up; for she said to her husband, I will not go up till the child be weaned, and then I will bring him, that he may appear before the Lord, and there abide forever.—So the woman abode, and gave her son suck until she weaned him. And when she had weaned him, she took him up with her—and brought him to the house of the Lord in Shiloh; and the child was young.—And the child did minister to the Lord before Eli the priest.—And the child Samuel grew before the Lord." 1 Sam. i. 21–24, and 2 xi. 21.—"To Timothy, dearly beloved son;—without ceasing I have remembrance of thee in my prayers night and day; greatly desiring to see thee,—when I call to remembrance the unfeigned faith that is in thee, which dwelt first in thy grand-mother Lois, and thy mother Eunice; and I am persuaded that in thee also.—And that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise to salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus;—thoroughly furnished to all good works." 2 Tim. i. 2–5. and iii. 15, 17. See also Ephesians vi. 4.

Though the pages of the Harbinger have furnished its readers with many useful suggestions upon the all-important subject of family education, especially in the conversations of the Carleton family; yet the particular duties of the primary department—that of the nursery, do not appear to have been distinctly considered. Now it is in the plastic subjects of this department, that the formative impressions of human character are inlaid. The infant sees, feels, and retains the impressions thus made upon its perception, long before it can think for itself; yea, indeed, these constitute the very elements of its thoughts and desires; or of its aversions. It should then be handled and treated; dressed, fed, and amused, with all that propriety and sobriety of treatment, which is naturally calculated to make just impressions of what is comely, decent, and proper, in the elementary contour of

human character; being entirely unaccustomed to any thing foolish, whimsical, or ridiculous, but to the very contrary. And why should not this be universally the case? Is not every mother's son naturally the same with Samuel and Timothy, and equally near and dear to its mother?—a sensitive, rational creature, destined for eternity?—capable of being trained up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord?—of being thus prepared for the high destiny of eternally glorifying and enjoying its almighty Creator? Why, then, not receive and treat this highly privileged creature, as Hannah and Eunice did their sons? who, as far as mother's interest and agency could go, devoted them to the Lord; always considering and treating them accordingly;—and thus training them up for God.

In the course of some twelve or sixteen months, the beloved little creatures not only understand looks and gestures, but begin also to understand words. The endearing epithets of father and mother soon convey to the infant mind the most pleasing impressions and recollections. It also gets early acquainted with the common literal acceptation of the terms good and bad, pretty and ugly, love and hate, sweet and bitter, make, break, &c. &c.; and thus soon becomes the capable subject of oral instructions. Now as soon as this capability becomes sufficiently evident by being exercised for some time upon common sensible objects, its attention should be interestingly and incessantly called to a realizing grateful acknowledgment of its Creator. This, we presume, may be successfully attempted in the following manner:—

Mother.—My dear child, where is your father?—He is ploughing the corn to make cakes for you.—Do you not love father for that? Who bought you this pretty coat, my dear?—Do you not know it was father? Do you not love father for buying you this pretty coat to keep you warm? Do you know who made it, my dear? It was mother made it. Do you not love me for making you this pretty coat? Give me a kiss, if you love me;—my sweet son.—Do you know who made you, my dear?—It was heavenly Father.—Do you not know, my dear son, that you have a heavenly Father, who lives away up in heaven, above the sun, moon, and stars; who made you, and me, and your father; and gave you to us, to be our son. Do you not love heavenly Father, my dear, for making you, and me, and your father; and for giving you to us to be our son? 'Tis heavenly Father that keeps us alive, and takes care of us;—that makes all the good things grow in the fields, in the garden, in the orchard;—all the good berries, and apples, and fruits of every kind, that we eat; and all the beautiful buds, and blossoms and flowers, that smell so sweet. Do you not love heavenly Father, my dear, for making you all these good things? &c. &c. &c.

Thus most infants, from twelve to eighteen months old, are capable of being instructed; so that at the age of two years, they would mostly be able to connect the idea of the heavenly Father, with every object of delight and enjoyment; and, thus, not only become duly acquainted with the divine existence, but also with the delightful attributes of his nature,—his power, wisdom, goodness, and love.

To accomplish this blissful attainment would, however, in the mean time, require the incessant attention of the parents; especially of the mother, whose special province it is to form the infant mind. It would have to be the constant business of every day, as far as opportunity would permit. Yes, indeed, suitable opportunities should be sought for presenting to the child's consideration the various objects, both terrestrial and celestial, with which Heaven has graciously favored us, for the blissful purpose of acquiring and communicating the knowledge of our bountiful Creator.—Thus, by the time the child had completed its third year, it would have become a practical deist or theist: it would recognize God in every thing; and every thing in its relation to God, as his creature; and so be prepared, in due time, for the enjoyment of our holy religion; which is founded upon a realizing persuasion of the being and perfections of our heavenly Father.

Moreover, while the child is thus training, in the arms, and under the tender care of its maternal guardian, it should be kept out of the way of corrupting examples, as much as possible. Its associates, if it have any, should be pupils of the same school, that have received the same maternal training. "For evil communications corrupt good manners:" especially in infancy and early youth; for, at this period, "custom becomes, indeed, a second nature." Nor will it unfrequently happen, that, after all the care that can be taken to train the infant mind, and to preserve it from the contagion of bad example, there will still be need for coercive measures; for—"Folly is bound up in the heart of a child; but the rod of correction will drive it far from him." Prov. xxii. 15. "Withhold not correction from thy child; for if thou beatest him with the rod he shall not die. Thou shalt beat him with the rod, and shalt deliver his soul from hell." Prov. xxiii. 13, 14. Hence it necessarily follows, that—"He that spareth his rod, hateth his son; but he that loveth him, chasteneth him betimes." Prov. xiii. 24. However, we should not correct to gratify passion; nor should we ever threaten or inflict chastisement, till it appear indispensably necessary; and then it should be done, not in wrath, lest we provoke our children to wrathful resentment, and they be discouraged; but in the name of the Lord; that is, upon principle of obedience. See Eph. vi. 4. and Col. iii. 17, 21.—"Whatever ye do in word or deed, do

all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God, even the Father, by him." And—"Whether you eat, or drink, or whatever you do, do all to the glory of God." 1 Cor. x. 31. Wherefore, upon the whole, it should be done with prayers; if it be done to "save a soul from hell—to the glory of God:" "For salvation is of the Lord." And this way of administering correction is divinely calculated to have the proper effect, both upon the parent and upon the child.—Upon the latter, as expressive of the heinous nature, ruinous effects, and terrible consequences of sin; for a child ought not to be seriously corrected, till it can be made sensible of the evil of disobedience; which, for the most part, it may be, if duly instructed, by the time it is three years old; for, by that time, it may be made equally acquainted with its obligations both to its heavenly and earthly father; for it has its parents' word alike for both; and, beyond that, for the first five or six years, it can know nothing of either. This solemn prayerful way of correcting is also equally calculated to have the proper effect upon the mind of the parent, by filling it with deep impressions of its sacred responsibilities both to God and the child, and also with the blissful assurance that the chastisement, thus administered, shall not be in vain in the Lord; for it is written—"Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old, he will not depart from it." Prov. xxii. 6. But the training here intended is not confined to correction for incidental faults; it covers the whole area of a Christian education, both with respect to sentiment, speech, and behaviour—to food, raiment, and exercise. Hence the necessity of first commencing with the mind, in the nursery; next, of adverting to the use made of speech, when the child has acquired it; and lastly to its actions, when it understands right and wrong.

Also, its food and raiment should be plain, simple, and suitable; to answer the natural and necessary purposes of health and convenience; —not for pampering appetite, luxury, and pride. All its promised rewards—gratifications and indulgences for good behaviour—should be of a pious and virtuous character and tendency; such as visiting and relieving the poor—the sick; and contributing to the instruction of the ignorant, by supplying them with books and teachers, &c.; and that by so doing, they might have the gratification of pleasing their heavenly Father, and of doing good to their fellow-creatures; and thus become pious, sympathizing, and fruitful in good works. And, would all this be any thing more than training them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; by thus teaching them, from early infancy, his gracious character, as their heavenly Father; and thus inducing them to make it their continual and delightful study—in all things to please *him*,

who made *them;*—and *all things* for *their* gratification and delight?—And can any thing, short of this, rationally and scripturally answer this high and blissful purpose? Let parents consider this.—But, alas! How seldom do we see children thus treated—thus educated?—Rather, do we not generally see them treated as puppets—toys—mere play things? As dolls and dandies—epicures and gluttons—mere sensualists—without any principle superior to other animals. Yes, indeed, many parents, (I had almost said *most*) take more care in training the inferior animals—such as favorite birds, dogs, horses and oxen, than they do in the moral and religious culture of their children; at least, for the first three, four, or five years: by which time, for the most part, not only the radical principles, but even the prominent outline of their character is formed: for, by this time, all their faculties, sensitive and intellectual, are wholly occupied with sensible customs and objects; which, of course, must occupy their whole attention, having no conception of any thing else. And who knows not? that moral and religious ideas, (which are sometimes called spiritual) are the most difficult both to ob-tain, and re-tain. Wherefore they should be exhibited as early as possible to the plastic mind; and impressed upon it, while disengaged;—whilst of all impressions it is alike susceptible. A tailor's child of eighteen months old, being duly taught as above, would acknowledge, with the same easy confidence, that its heavenly Father *made it;* as it would that its earthly father *made its coat;* and express, with the same apparent gratitude, its love to both: the reality of which, if any one should doubt it, could be very easily tested. Upon the whole;—these things being evidently so, there must be pious spiritually-minded Christian parents, before there can be pious obedient children;—pious families. The old saying,—"Can any good thing come out of Nazareth:" is full of meaning. Man, especially during his childhood, is a creature of circumstances. He must necessarliy receive his impressions from what he daily sees and hears. If these be altogether, or for the most part, about what we shall eat, and what we shall drink, and wherewithal we shall be clothed:—if the conversation and objects constantly presented to the infant mind, be addressed to our sensual appetites—to the gratification of "the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life's;" what can a creature of such circumstances be, but a mere sensualist, absorbed in the desire and pursuit of such things? Hence appears most demonstrably the indispensable necessity of family reformation *towards* God; in order to family education *for* God. "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean? Not one." It required a *Hannah* to train a Samuel:—a *Eunice* to train a Timothy.

May the good Lord hasten family reformation! For till that take place, "Zion must remain a wilderness; Jerusalem a desolation."

☞ *To the mourners in Zion,*

THOMAS CAMPBELL.

A SCRIPTURAL VIEW

OF

CHRISTIAN CHARACTER AND PRIVILEGE.

Section 1. "BLESSED are the poor in spirit; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are they that mourn; for they shall be comforted. Blessed are the meek; for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are they that do hunger and thirst after righteousness; for they shall be filled. Blessed are the merciful; for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God. Blessed are the peacemakers; for they shall be called the children of God.—Ye are the salt of the earth.—Ye are the light of the world."*

2. "He (Christ) came to his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name; which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.† —And, Except a man be born of water and Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.‡—If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away; behold all things are become new: and all things of God.‖—Of his own will begat he us by the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first fruits of his creatures.§—Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever¶.—For, in Christ Jesus, neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.**—If any one will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me.††—If any one come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple. And whoever doth not bear his cross, and come after me, cannot be my disciple.—Whoever he be of you, that forsaketh not all that he hath, he cannot be my disciple."‡‡

3. "We walk by faith, not by sight. For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all

* Matth. v. 3—9, 13, 14. † John i. 11—3. ‡ John iii 5, ‖ 2 Cor. v. 17.
§ Jas. i. 18. ¶ 1 Pet. i 23. ** Gal vi 15. †† Luke ix. 23. ‡‡ Luke xiv. 26, 27, & 33.

dead:—and that he died for all, that they who live, should not henceforth live to themselves, but to him who died for them, and rose again.—Wherefore we labor, that, whether present or absent, we may be accepted by him.*—For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision, nor uncircumcision availeth any thing; but faith, which worketh by love.†—Though I speak with the tongues of men, and of angels, and have not love, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal: and though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge: and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not love, I am nothing. And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not love, it profiteth nothing. Love suffereth long and is kind; love envieth not; love vaunteth not itself; is not puffed up, doth not behave itself unseemly; seeketh not its own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil; rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; beareth, or covereth, all things; believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things; love never faileth: &c. Now abides faith, hope, love, these three; but the greatest of these is love.‖—Beloved, let us love one another; for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not, knoweth not God; for God is love. In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another. If we love one another, God dwelleth in us; and his love is perfected in us.—And we have known and believed the love that God hath to us. God is love; and he that dwelleth in love, dwelleth in God, and God in him. Herein is our love made perfect, that we may have boldness in the day of judgment; because as he is, so are we in this world. There is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear; because fear hath torment. He that feareth is not made perfect in love. We love him, because he first loved us."§

4. "Lay not up for yourselves treasures on earth, where moth and rust do corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal: but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through, nor steal: for where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.—No man can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and

* 2 Cor. v. 7, 9, 14, 15. † Gal. v. 6. ‡ 1 Cor. xiii 1—8, 13.
§ 1 John iv. 7—12. 16—19.

Mammon. Therefore, I say to you, be not anxious for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment?—But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added to you."*

5. "I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that you present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, which is your reasonable service. And be not conformed to this world; but be you transformed by the renewing of your mind, that you may prove what is that good, and acceptable, and perfect will of God."‡—"Whether ye eat, or drink, or whatever you do, do all to the glory of God."†—"Whatever you do in word, or deed, do all in the name of the Lord Jesus, giving thanks to God, even the Father, by him."‖

6. "Godliness with contentment is great gain. For we brought nothing into this world, and it is certain we can carry nothing out. Having, then, food and raiment, let us be therewith content. For they that will be rich fall into temptation, and a snare, and into many foolish and hurtful lusts, which drown men in destruction and perdition. For the love of money is the root of all evil; which, while some coveted after, they have erred from the faith, and pierced themselves through with many sorrows. But thou, O man of God, flee these things; and follow after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, meekness. Fight the good fight of faith, lay hold on eternal life."§ "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation, hath appeared to all men, teaching us, that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; looking forward for that blessed hope [of eternal life; see ch. iii. 7.] and the glorious appearing of the great God, and our Saviour Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify to himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works.¶

7. "Wherefore, beloved, seeing that you look for such things, be diligent, that you may be found of him in peace, without spot and blameless."**—"Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him: for all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof; but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever."††—"Wherefore, beloved, building up yourselves on your most holy faith, praying in the Holy Spirit,

* Rom. xii. 1, 2. † 1 Cor. x. 31. ‡ Col. iii. 17. ‖ 1 Tim. vi. 6—12.
§ Titus ii. 11—14. ¶ 2 Peter iii. 14. ** 1 John ii. 16—17. †† Jude xx. 21.

keep yourselves in the love of God, looking for the mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ unto eternal life."*

8. "To him that overcometh, will I grant to sit with me in my throne; even as I also overcame, and am set down with my Father in his throne. He that overcometh shall inherit all things; and I will be his God, and he shall be my son.—Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have a right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city."†—"Come, you blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: for I was hungry, and you gave me meat; I was thirsty, and you gave me drink; I was a stranger, and you took me in; naked, and you clothed me; I was sick, and you visited me; I was in prison, and you came to me."‡—"He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith to the churches."

The all-important intention of the above collection of scripture testimony for the development of Christian character, has been occasioned by a deep and painful conviction of the sad and almost universal deficiency, in this respect, every where manifestly evident, though apparently little noticed. When we consider the peculiar distinguishing attributes of Christian character;—the heavenly origin and high destiny of Christians;—the indispensable necessity of the most unlimited self-denial, even in order to the commencement of the Christian course;—the formative principles of Christianity; namely, the faith and the love above described; also, the laws by which the Christian must be guided;—we are ready to exclaim,—What is become of Christianity!!!—Where is the Christian to be found!!! But we are anticipated in relation to this dismal state of things. It was foreseen and predicted from the beginning—that "in the last days, perilous times should come:"—that professors "should be self-lovers, money-lovers, &c. &c.—lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof." Having thus lost the real living exhibition of Christianity, we have infinite reason to bless God for the genuine, lively, authentic description, with which he has favored and furnished us; by the due consideration of which we may attain to a certain and satisfactory apprehension of genuine Christianity—of true Christian character. And, we humbly presume we may find in the above extracts, the grand comprehensive items of such a character. For this purpose, though they are so mixed as not to admit of a logical division, yet for convenience we have divided them into eight sections, as above.

Now in section 1st, we have seven distinct attributes of person

* Rev. iii. 21. & xxi. 7. & xxii. 13. & iii. 22. † Matth. xxv. 34—36. ‡ Rev. iii. 22.

character, and two of a relative nature. Of the former, the first is "poor in spirit;" not outwardly, in their external condition; but inwardly, in the state of their minds:—that is, humble, lowly, not aspiring, not puffed up, proud, self-conceited. The second is, "they that mourn," not at their temporal lot; but on account of sin: see Ezek. ix. 4, 6. The third is, "the meek." The fourth is, "they that hunger and thirst after righteousness." The fifth is, "the merciful." The sixth is, "the pure in heart;" that is,—hate all manner of sin. The seventh is, "the peace-makers.—Now the perfection and utility of those personal attributes are eminently displayed in the preservative and splendid utility of their relative epithets:—"The salt of the earth:"—"The light of the world." Alas! what a dreary loathsome world would this be, without light and salt?

But here a question of radical importance occurs:—Who are these that shine so bright, and smell so sweet; and whence came they? Surely, not of this dark loathsome world: for they light and preserve it. No.—They are from above; born of God;—of his own will begat he them by the word of truth, that they might be a kind of first fruits of his creatures. T. C.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

FAMILY CULTURE.

CONVERSATIONS AT THE CARLTON HOUSE.

No. VIII.

After reading in order the history of the deluge, Olympas thus began:—

Olympas. We are now come to the end of one world and the commencement of another. What, Thomas, were the causes that ushered in this awful catastrophe?

Thomas. Murder, violence, and rapine seem to have completed the measure of human enormities. Moses says, "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually."—"The earth was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence." "For all flesh had corrupted its way upon the earth; and God said, The end of all flesh is come before me: for the earth is filled with violence through them, and behold I will destroy them with the earth."

Olympas. God our Father, then, intended more than the destruction of the human race and the living creatures on the earth. He said he

would destroy them *with the earth*. Tell me, Susan, with what element did God destroy the earth with its inhabitants?

Susan. With water.

Olympas. Whence did the waters come, William?

William. From the windows of heaven, and from the fountains of the great deep.

Olympas. How long did it rain, James?

James. "Forty days and forty nights."

Olympas. How do you, Reuben, understand "the windows of heaven" and "the fountains of the great deep."

Reuben. The clouds may be called the windows of heaven, because the waters that float in the air, are poured through the clouds on the earth; and the subterraneous oceans may be called the fountains of the great deep, because they supply the lakes and seas with water.

Olympas. If the quantity of water in the earth be at all proportioned to the quantity on its surface, it only required an impulse from the almighty hand to overflow the earth, to submerge every mountain and hill to the depth of the tallest pines on their loftiest summits. But in doing this there must have been a tremendous disruption of the earth, the heaving up of new mountains, and the sinking down of immense areas of the ancient surface; so that while the waters of the great deep made for themselves new channels, their ancient beds were filled up with dilapidated masses of the primitive soil, and thus the earth itself, with its wicked inhabitants, was literally wasted and destroyed. Are there yet existing any monuments of this ancient deluge?

Reuben. I have read in the history of the Greeks and Western Nations accounts of the Flood; and of the traditions of the Chinese, the Africans, and Americans, concerning a deluge which left at great distance from the present seas, and on the summits of lofty mountains, trees deeply imbedded in the soil; with the teeth and bones of numerous land animals; as well as entire fish, sea shells, petrified fruits, ears of corn, and various vegetable remains of a former world. Sir William Jones, as I read the other day in his Indian Researches, has also added other monuments from the mythological traditions of those ancient nations, evidently deduced from Moses', or other ancient records of the same catastrophe long since lost.

Olympas. Philosophers, geologists, historians, religionists of every name, are constrained to admit one deluge at least. Some, indeed, arbitrarily deny its universality; but all admit its generality. How do you prove, Thomas Dilworth, its universality.

Thomas. Moses says, "The waters prevailed exceedingly upon the earth, and all the high hills that were under the whole heaven were

covered. Fifteen cubits and upwards did the waters prevail, and the mountains were covered."

Olympas. That is enough for those who take the word of the Lord for proof. Was the destruction of life also universal. I mean, of course, *terrestrial* life?

Thomas. The same author says, "And all flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl and of cattle, and of beasts, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every man."

Olympas. Definite enough. But, Susan, did the whole human race perish?

Susan. All but Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth, with their wives. In all eight persons.

Olympas. How, James, were these eight persons saved?

James. In an ark which Noah built.

Olympas. What were its dimensions, William?

William. Three hundred cubits by fifty: or, as you once computed it for us, five hundred feet long, seventy-five wide, and forty-five high.

Olympas. How many tons would it carry?

William. Forty-two thousand and five hundred tons—equal to eighty-five ships of five hundred tons burthen.

Olympas. Yes, and our most accomplished mathematical calculators say, that no vessel could have been more rationally and scientifically arranged and constructed, than was this immense ship, for the purpose of carrying a large freight without sailing far from the place of its construction. How long was it in being reared?

William. One hundred and twenty years.

Olympas. Of what sort of timber constructed, James?

James. Of gopher wood, covered over with pitch.

Olympas. But did I not teach you that *gopher* probably meant square timber, and that there was much reason to believe that the ark was built of cedar or of cypress, because these growths abound in Asia, and might have been called *gopher*, because they put out quadrangular branches in the same horizontal line. Thomas, how many quadrupeds do you suppose were taken into the ark?

Thomas. There were pairs of all sorts; but of the *clean* there were seven pairs.

Olympas. The difference between *clean* and *unclean* is, then, older than the flood. But are we, Thomas, to understand *clean* and *unclean* as referring to food or to sacrifice?

Thomas. To sacrifice, as it is evident that sacrifice was practised before the flood; but the eating of flesh began afterwards.

Olympas. How many sorts of clean animals, William?

William. Five—the calf, the sheep, the goat, the turtle-dove, and the pigeon. You said that Abraham offered all these on one altar, and that God ever after selected them for sacrifices!

Olympas. In the ark, then, there were how many quadrupeds?

Thomas. According to Buffon there are only some two hundred and fifty species, which would make only some five hundred and fifty in all, clean and unclean.

Olympas. But did I not show on a former occasion that this number was by far too small?—that from more recent and accurate details we might set down more than one thousand species of mamallia, (animals that nourish their young by breasts;) of birds, five thousand species; and of reptiles, insects, &c. one hundred thousand. Now, putting down the quadrupeds at 100 lbs. each, large and small, this gives only 100 tons weight; the birds 5 lbs. each, would give 75 tons; and all other terrestrial creatures would not yield over 50 tons more. In all animated nature, as known to man, taking of each one pair, the weight would not exceed 225 tons. But to be safe, double the amount, and say we have 450 tons; can any one then doubt the capacity of a vessel of 42,500 tons, to stow away the live stock of the earth, and provisions for one year!! The ark, then, was large enough and strong enough to contain comfortably all that Moses embarked upon it. In what form was it put together?

Thomas. In the form of a chest, square at each end; something like an Egyptian or New Orleans flat-boat.

Olympas. How many doors and windows, Susan?

Susan. Only one door and one window.

Olympas. Was the roof flat, James?

James. I do not read any thing about its roof.

Olympas. Read the 16th verse of the 6th chapter.

James. "A window shalt thou make to the ark, and in a cubit shalt thou finish it above; and the door of the ark shalt thou set in the side thereof, with lower, second, and third stories shalt thou make it."

Olympas. "And in a cubit shalt thou finish *it* above." The *it* refers to the ark, and not to the door. The roof was raised one cubit in the centre that the rain might run off with more facility. Think you, William, this vessel was designed for sailing?

William. Not for sailing, sir; but for floating.

Olympas. Did it find a shore, or landing far from the port whence it was launched?

William. It rested on Mount Ararat, in Armenia, which, for so long a time, was a very short distance; Ararat lying in latitude 39, 30, N., and in 40, 30, E. longitude, nearly in the middle of the immense stony

ridge called Taurus, which, according to the ancients, girdled the whole earth.

Olympas. How high was this summit called Mount Ararat?

William. It is said to be as high as Mount Blanc, in Europe, which is about three miles above the level of the sea.

Olympas. Is not this mountain covered with snow, Reuben?

Reuben. It is at this time generally enveloped in snow to the extent of 5000 feet. But it is not presumable that it was on the very peak of this mountain that the ark rested.

Olympas. Do you recollect the Persian name of this mountain?

Reuben. They call it *Asis*, which means "The Happy Mountain," because Noah landed there.

Olympas. And what do the Armenians say, who inhabit that region?

Reuben. That Noah, after landing his family and stock, settled at Erivan, 36 miles from Ararat, and in its vicinity planted a vineyard, where to this day grapes are cultivated, and excellent wine manufactured.

Olympas. James, tell me—How did Noah decide when he should leave the ark?

James. He sent forth a raven, and then a dove.

Olympas. Why did he send the raven first, William?

William. You said that the raven being a bird of prey, and feasting on dead animals, would most readily discover whether the earth were dry by two senses—smelling and seeing; and would indicate this by not returning, as was the fact. But next he sent a dove, fond of the ground, of picking up seeds, and of returning to its rest; but finding no earth, it soon returned. This induced Noah, after another Sabbath, to send it out on a second expedition. It then came back, carrying in its beak an olive leaf plucked from a tree.

Olympas. What, Reuben, is the ancient geography of that region on which Noah made his first settlement?

Reuben. Strabo says it was a land of olives. It was high and hilly, having beautiful plains and valleys between its mountains; very rich and easily cultivated, and peculiarly salubrious.

Olympas. Rufus, can you give us the calendar of the year of the world 1656, or the memorable year of the flood, according to Stackhouse, Basnage, and some other books that I gave you to read.

Rufus. I will try, sir. The year began in September.

1. September. Methuselah died, aged 969 years.

2. October. Noah and his family entered the ark.

3. November 17. "The fountains of the great deep were broken up."

December 26. The rain began and continued 40 days and 40 nights.

January. All the men and beasts on earth perished.
February. The rain continued.
March 27. The waters began to abate.
April 17. The ark rested on Ararat in Armenia.
May. They rested while the waters were retreating.
June 1st. The tops of the mountains appeared.
July 11th. Noah sent the raven.
18th. He sent a dove.
25th. It returned with the olive branch.
August 2d. The dove made its third and final departure from the ark.
September 1st. The dry land appeared.
October 27. Noah went out of the ark with all his house.

Olympas. Very good. Tell me, Susan, of what is an olive leaf the emblem?

Susan. Of peace and returning prosperity.

Olympas. And of what, Eliza, is a dove the emblem?

Eliza. Of peace and love.

Olympas. Any incident in the New Testament that reminds you of this?

Eliza. Yes; the dove from heaven descended on the head of Jesus, indicating peace and love, symbol of the Holy Spirit, spirit of peace and holiness and love divine. Happy omen of the advent of the great pacificator—the Son of God. Presage, too, of the peace of all the sons of God.

Olympas. Francis, you are fond of history and of geography. What countries afford the strongest memorials of this awful visitation of a universal deluge.

Francis. All the lofty eminences on earth attest the deluge. On them all are found the spoils of the ocean. Skeletons of sea fish, and aquatic monsters of all sorts, are scattered on the Alps, the Appenines, the Pyrenees, the Andes, Ararat, Atlas, and every peak from Mexico to Japan. Not only this, but in America we find the animals and plants of the torrid zone petrified; in Europe we find American animals and plants preserved in rocks, in ice, and in eternal snows. The moose deer, a native of America, is found buried in Ireland; Asiatic and African elephants have been disinterred in England; crocodiles, natives of Egypt, are found in the rocks of Germany; and American shell-fish and the fish of our seas are found in the four quarters of the globe. The tea plant has been found petrified in Ohio, and the fish of India converted into rocks at the bottoms of our rivers.

Olympas. Were all the trees uprooted think you, Francis, in this tremendous catastrophe?

Francis. We have no reason to conclude that they were. All trees from one to two hundred feet high, which covered the summits of the highest lands, stood many feet out of the waters. Indeed, as the water only rose 22 feet above the Himalaya mountains, or the loftiest Asiatic summits, many trees of humble stature would lift their boughs above the turbid waters.

Olympas. But are not the tops of the Himalaya, the Andes, Ararat, and many others, covered with eternal snows; and, therefore, incapable of vegetable or animal existence!

Francis. They are so now. But did you not teach us that before the deluge there were no frozen nor barren peaks; that all the earth from pole to pole was of one temperature, and that one perpetual spring and summer presided over the whole planet; that the earth was not dependent on the sun alone for heat, but was warmed by the decomposition of its own minerals, or by those subterraneous fires which after the deluge were so deeply quenched or slacked as to afford no heat; and that now depending on solar influence alone, we have an alternation of heat and cold, of summer and winter, of seed time and harvest, by which change of the elements the stature of human life has been contracted from 7, 8, and 900, to 70, 80, and 90 years.

Olympas. True, I have substantially, at different times, made such suggestions to some of you. The axis of the earth is inclined to the ecliptic 66½ degrees; consequently it declines 23½ from a perpendicular position to the plane of the ecliptic, or to the plane of its own orbit; and this gives us a variety of seasons: whereas if the axis of the earth were perpendicular to the plane of its own orbit round the sun, the following three consequences would be inevitable:—

1. Its north and south poles would be always enlightened.
2. There would be no diversity of days and nights.
3. And we would have but one season throughout the year.

Such, I think, was the antediluvian earth. Therefore, the health, vigor, and longevity of man—therefore, the plants and animals of all climates were then found in all the latitudes of human abode—and therefore, too, the great immorality of the human race after the fall, and previous to the deluge. So happy a climate, so perpetual a spring, so vigorous a constitution, so long a life, did not suit so fallen and so degraded a being as man. The mildest climes, the most genial seasons, and the most fruitful soils, when combined, produce the most luxuriant crops of human follies, vices, and enormities. The temperate zones, the six months winter, and the six months summer, have, since the flood, been the abodes of the most exemplary characters, the regions of the most mental and moral vigor of our species, and will

likely continue to be so till the millennial age shall have introduced a better order of things.

The flood changed the constitution of the earth, and probably did it chiefly by changing its position; by sinking, as it were, one of its poles 23½ degrees towards the plane of its own orbit, and elevating the other the same distance above it: thus subjecting it to a continual alternation of cold and heat, from the extreme horrors of a northern winter to the scorching heats of a tropical summer.

Moses induces the belief that a radical and extensive change has pervaded the entire constitution of our devoted planet. The cataracts of heaven opened their stores of indignation, and the deep dark fountains of the great abyss were broken up to consummate its ruin. An ocean's flood was heaved from beneath over all its fertile valleys, sloping hills, and lofty mountains. The planet yawned as if bursting asunder to swallow down the untold millions of its infidel and atheistic inhabitants. The solid crust of the "rock-ribbed earth" was rent in pieces, while the solid stratas ascending from the beds of ancient oceans, gave mighty proof that Omnipotence had indignantly risen to assert the rights of its insulted majesty before an astonished universe. The former abodes of men became the beds of new seas and oceans, while the channels of the ancient waters occasionally became the *terra firma* of a new world.

The sea-drenched earth, the miserable wreck of its ancient grandeur, chilled by its long submersion in this watery waste, became the cold and comparatively dreary abode of the new family of man. But Noah, soon as it became dry, reared an altar to the Lord, and presented a grateful offering to his Almighty Benefactor, who had safely piloted his unwieldly ship on a dark and shoreless ocean to a safe and comfortable anchorage in the cliffs of Ararat—where we shall leave him till our next lesson. A. C.

NOTICE OF THE REV. R. W. LANDIS.

Under date of April 3, 1840, mailed and post-marked "April 6, Allentown, Pa.," I received a letter from Mr. Landis, author of the calumnies and misrepresentations which appeared in the American Biblical Repository of 1839, reviewed by me in the Millennial Harbinger of 1839, and in the Repository of April last. This letter, by certain quotations from my periodical of my editorial rules and procedure towards persons noticed on my pages, so far as respects my forwarding to them such numbers as concerned them, or in which they happen

to be named—reminds me of my duties to Mr. Landis, and complains that my rules had been suspended in his case—in one word, *that I did not send him those numbers in which he was named and reviewed.* His words are—"Recently you have written some bitter things against me, (as I am informed, and published them in several numbers of the same periodical, together with some advice!) *and yet have never permitted me to see a line of them!!*" Mr. Landis then proceeds—"You are aware that should I publish the foregoing in a paper, it would be readily copied into all the papers West and South which are adverse to you; *but I shall not do this*, if I can procure the numbers of the Harbinger without it; and especially as your not sending them may have been an oversight on your part. Will you, then, do me the favor to mail me the numbers referred to, directed to R. W. Landis, Allentown, Pa?"

To this letter, received during my absence from home, my Clerk replied as follows:—

BETHANY, Va., April 13th, 1840.

Dear Sir—Yours of the 3d instant, to Mr. A. Campbell, is to hand. He is now absent from home, on a visit to the city of Pittsburg. So soon as he returns I will hand your communication to him.

In the mean time I would, however, say, that Mr. Campbell instructed me when I took charge of his business, (more than five years ago,) to make it a rule always to have the Harbinger forwarded to the address of all persons whose names were found in the number. I have always forwarded duplicates of all numbers of the Harbinger to those who were at all alluded to in it; and in your case I mailed three copies of Mr. Campbell's notices and replies, on three several mail days, to your address, at Jeffersonville, Pa., so as to be certain that you would receive one. You will, therefore, perceive that it was not the fault of Mr. C. that you did not receive his review and notices of your production in the Biblical Repository.

I now send you a copy of each number, containing all he has said about the subject, which I hope you will receive and acknowledge.

With respect, yours,

W. F. M. ARNY,
FOR A. CAMPBELL.

Mr. Landis' letter, mailed the 6th, was received and answered on the 13th of April, as above stated. But before Mr. Landis could by any possibility have heard from me, in no less than *two* days after the mailing of his letter to me, under date of the 8th of said April, he appears in print in "The Christian Observer," of Philadelphia—his promise to me to the contrary notwithstanding, averring that I had not sent him the Harbinger containing my review of his essay! Yes, veracious reader, in a letter dated the 8th of April, and published on the 16th in the Christian Observer, addressed to "Dr. Cleland and Rev. J. C. Stiles," of Kentucky; of myself he says, "*He did not send me the Harbinger containing his Review of my Essay.*" He solicits

aids from these Kentucky chiefs to assist him in putting down the reformation in Kentucky, living as he does so far east of the theatre of debate. "While the whole subject is fully before his mind in all its bearings, he would," he says, "furnish a complete and thorough refutation of the system *in extenso*." We shall thank him for such a refutation *in extenso*: for the hitherto imperfect refutations have only multiplied our friends in five-fold ratios. A complete refutation *in extenso* might increase our strength in seven-fold proportions. In Kentucky alone, under the partial refutations of our heresy by Presbyterian Doctors, its friends are to Presbyterians, perhaps, as three or four to one. Do, Mr. Landis, let us have *in extenso*, a complete refutation of Campbellism!

But that the zeal and candor of our refuter, *in extenso*, in the case before us, may appear in their just proportions, I must give an extract from his second letter to me, dated April 25, 1840. After acknowledging the receipt of brother Arny's letter, with the accompanying documents, in a very courteous manner, he lays the blame of former failures on the mail arrangements at Jeffersonville. His words are—"Some singular and unaccountable fatality has ever appeared to attend the mail arrangements appertaining to Jeffersonville. *I always found it so*, and for many weeks continuously have often not received a single number of a periodical which was regularly forwarded weekly." Now the question is, With all this knowledge, which surely did not burst into the mind of Mr. Landis from the 8th to the 25th of April, 1840, in the name of truth and candor how could he venture to publish to the world, and especially to those whom he sought to rouse from their beds of languishing to enter upon a new crusade, while as yet the blood of former wounds was not staunched? I ask, How could the Rev. Mr. R. W. Landis, knowing the "*continuous failure*" of the post-office to which his packets had been sent, presume to publish to the world what he could not possibly know, viz. that I had failed to send those numbers of the Harbinger! And still worse, how could he, within two short days after a *promise* not to publish the failure, sit down and gravely communicate it to the world as a charge against me, that I had not sent him the aforesaid documents!—and that, too, not only under the belief that the papers south and west would copy his statements, (and never mine,) and send them all round the land; but with the demand that "the Lutheran Observer and Western Luminary will please copy the above." Is this gentlemanly, moral, or Christian deportment? If so, I have not yet learned the meaning of those words. I have not seen, however, that any of those papers have obeyed his orders, or yielded to his suggestions. If they have, I can only say that no copy has arrived here.

But this is not all. I wrote a letter to Mr. Landis, dated May 8, 1840, in reply to his of April 25, post-marked 27, in which I gravely asked for an explanation of this conduct. In which epistle I asked, How can you, Mr. Landis, from such a display of the want of Christian candor, imagine that I can have any respect for you as an honest and conscientious professor! In the same epistle I observed, "I go for discussion full and free: I will publish your pieces in the Harbinger, if you will have my replies published in all the papers in which you seek to have yours published." Some time after a reply to this letter was received here, and replied to by my Clerk in my absence, (for I am just now returned after an absence of several weeks.) This is decidedly the most scurrilous and vulgar document received in my office within my memory. It has secured its apparent objects. Its vulgarity and rudeness the author, I presume, rationally enough calculated would prohibit its appearance in any religious or moral periodical devoted to reformation, and would terminate the chances of any agreement between him and me for such a discussion as he would seem to have in view. He would pretend to have a desire to appear on my pages; but he took good care to secure a refusal by placing himself clearly and unequivocally amongst those whom respect for the present state of civilization, morality, and Christian decorum peremptorily exclude from our pages.

But, in a somewhat improved suit, he has re-appeared in a few pages in the July "American Biblical Repository," in a very weak and subdued tone, compared with his former essays. A brief exposition of these ebbings of his neap tide may be expected in our next number. Our pages are always open to a decent and gentlemanly reply from any quarter, to any thing we have advanced, or do advance, in the great cause of reformation, so loudly called for, and so universally needed in this generation. A. C.

SIN AND ITS CONSEQUENCES.

"Forasmuch as many have taken it in hand to set forth in order a declaration" of their views, "it seems good to me also to set forth" some views upon this subject.

That *sin, in itself considered, is evil*, and *only evil*, is admitted by all who believe in its existence: but at the same time it is contended by *many, very many*, that in its effects and consequences it is an excellent thing! Of this number are *many* whom I most ardently love for the

truth's sake. Our beloved brother R. R. I see in his "Dialogue on Sin," inclines to this view.

Now, although my partialities for some of these brethren are very strong, yet they do not carry me quite so far as to say with Cicero, "I would rather think *wrongly* with Plato than *rightly* with any one else." For my own part, I believe that *sin*, not only in the *abstract*, but in the *concrete*—not only in its own *nature*, but in all its *effects* and *consequences*, is "*evil, and only evil, and that continually.*"

I wish to examine some of the assumptions upon this subject. 1st. It is assumed that if man had remained in *innocence*, he must also have remained in *ignorance*. 2d. If man had not sinned, he would always have remained in Eden. 3d. If *sin* had not intervened, man could never have formed a character. 4th. And neither could the attributes of the Creator have been displayed.

To all these positions I answer, Nay! The proof is wanting. As to the first position, it is avowed that the forbidden tree was called "the tree of *knowledge* of *good* and *evil*." I conclude that this only means that he should know them as contradistinguished from each other. I think that a man may have all the real substantial enjoyment of health, without ever being tortured by disease; but it is true he cannot know health as contradistinguished from sickness; but all the pleasure that arises from the *contrast* is purely imaginary! It is true, also, that there may be circumstances connected with the disease and recovery—as the affectionate vigils of friends, and the kindness and skill of a benevolent physician: these may awaken the liveliest emotions of gratitude, the exercise of which is always a source of true happiness: but of these things the disease was only the *occasion*, not the cause! If I had never heard of *disease*, it would be no happiness to me to learn of *medicine* or a *physician*. But how it should be urged that man must have remained in *ignorance*, as the consequence of remaining in *innocence*, I cannot see! Is it to be supposed that the "unfallen spirits" have never increased in wisdom and knowledge? The proposition needs but to be stated. Certainly man in primeval innocence and glory would have enjoyed infinite advantages for the acquisition of all useful and blissful knowledge over man in his fallen, animalized, and wretched state.

But 2d. I cannot see the necessity that man should have remained eternally in the garden of Eden, if he remained pure and faithful. We are told that the inheritance of the saints, the everlasting kingdom, is a kingdom prepared from before the foundation of the world. It was prepared for *man*. But it was for a certain description of character—for the pure—for those who had sustained trial—who had resisted

me, I confess, a mystery. Learned men will, of course, differ in this matter; but that such men as Thomas Scott, Whitby, Henry, Doddridge, Benson, Adam Clarke, Beza, and many others, should have taken the above view of it, will exculpate us from the charge of pedantry in giving the same view. These facts are asserted in the verse: first, Barnabas and Saul convened with the congregation; second, taught the multitude; third, denominated the disciples *Christians*. That Barnabas and Saul *were assembled* with the church, is true, but not the whole truth; for *they* assembled *themselves:* that much people *were taught*, is true, but not the whole truth; for *Paul* and *Barnabas* taught them: and that the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch, is also true, but not the whole truth; for *Barnabas* and *Saul* so called them. 'It came to pass that they (Barnabas and Saul) called the disciples Christians.' This is indisputably the natural construction of the verse.' Scott *in loco*,' [*Detector.*]

"But we have not yet got to the root of the matter. We must dig deeper still. Our English Testament conceals from the reader a still more important mystery; for rendering a verb which is really in the active voice, as if it were in the passive, it totally eclipses by far the most important thought on this subject that could possibly be desired. In short, it conceals the important fact that it was Paul and Barnabas who named the disciples Christians. Taking Beza for a foundation, then a strictly literal translation would, in my judgment, read as follows:—

'And Barnabas went to Tarsus to seek Saul; and having found him, he brought him to Antioch; and it came to pass, that they jointly, for a whole year, assembled with the congregation, and instructed a vast crowd, and named first at Antioch the disciples Christians.' Acts xi. 25, 26.

So much for the present. Let the reader be grave and contemplative, and we will show him still greater things than these. Be no enthusiast; for meditation and calm thinking, purity of intention and the nobler virtues of courage and self-government alone fit a man for the settlement of great questions. Timidity, alarm, resentment, and the baser passions of pride and anger, wholly unfit a man for marching in the front of a great people. There is deliverance with God for the righteous." *Evangelist.*

First, with regard to the *Detector*. He says that Paul and Barnabas should have done two things, and not the third—viz.—have given the denomination, is, to him, a *mystery*. In this he speaks the truth, and sincerely, I doubt not. It is a mystery to more than the Detector; but it will not be long a mystery to our acute and penetrating brother, for he learns as fast as any brother in my knowledge. It will be to some a mystery why he should have translated the passive infinitive in the first of the three things actively, as does also the Evangelist; for it is not the first aor. act., but the first aor. pass. infinitive, *sunachthenai*, they *were* assembled or convened—not they convened with the church. These brethren had better, at some leisure time, explain

to us the mystery why they themselves translate the *passive* voice *actively*, before they complain of the Episcopalian translators for translating the *active* voice *passively!* I think I can vindicate the King's Episcopalians, and shall leave them to reveal their own mysteries.

I have above stated a curious philological fact—viz. that when the named are themselves the subject of this verb, or when a name is given from a business or office, it is uniformly translated as if passive. The philological reasons may be given, but they will not weigh with all my readers so much as the authorities which I have to advance, a sample of which is here given:—

1st. Robertson, Stokius, &c. translate the active verb in this acceptation by the passive *Nominor*, *Apellor*, I am named, I am called. They give instances from Plutarch, and other Greek authors, where in the infinitive active it is and must be rendered as if in the passive voice.

2d. Parkhurst, in his Greek and English Lexicon, gives "*to be called or named,*" as its constant acceptation in all such associations.

3d. But it is proved to be so used by an evidence which our common readers can fully appreciate. I wonder why our brother Editors have not found a revelation of the mystery complained of, Acts xi. 26. in Rom. vii. 3. Paul says, "She shall be called an adulteress." Did not the Detector nor the Evangelist know that it is the future active, in this passage, (*chreematisei?*) Why, then, wonder that our translators should have done in Acts xi. 26. what they had seen them do elsewhere!

Will they read Rom. vii. 3., actively, 'She shall call herself an adulteress'! If not, why, in the only other passage in which it is found connected with giving a name, should they complain of its being translated passively? *In the New Testament it is found only twice in connexion with being named. In both places it is in the active form, but it must be translated passively in both.* The Evangelist and Detector must admit it in one of these two only cases. I am confident they will—they do admit it. Why, then, I ask, in the name of reason, refuse it in the other case! Is not the mystery fully revealed!

4th. There is another important matter in reference to the three things affirmed, Acts xi. 26., which our friends seem not to have noticed. They say Paul and Barnabas met with the church. In the second place, they taught a great multitude. With them the question is, Why not make the same two persons the *accusative* before the last infinitive—why not say they called the disciples Christians?

One plain reason is given. The verb in this connexion must be translated passively. But there is another unobserved by our brother Editors: the last clause is cut off from the same construction by the

introduction of the particle *te*, whose force is not the same as *kai*. It is not a connective that like *kai* secures the same regimen. It connects to the sentence or the enunciation, by a more slender link than the copulatives *kai* and *de*. It both detaches and connects. Hence it is never found like *kai* or *de* in the beginning of a sentence, but preceding the last clause, which it frequently superadds to the sense, and not to the language or regimen of the period. Any one who will read in the original the Acts of the Apostles, will find abundant illustration of this point. Some copies of the New Testament, so confident of this, make this a new verse, and read it, "Moreover, the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch." As this is too recondite for most of our readers, we shall come to a still more convincing evidence.

Some efforts are made to sustain the *active* translation by authority. Hence the Detector quotes Thomas Scott, Whitby, Henry, Doddridge, Benson, A. Clarke, and Beza, as agreeing with him in regarding Paul and Barnabas as the imposers of this name. But he is mistaken in this. He confounds in some of them their noticing and commenting on such a translation with their approbation of it. They do not sanction such a translation. One or two of them may be favorable to it; but as he has arrayed them, their witness cannot be accepted. The Evangelist also has given us some names—some Lord Bishops, some Doctors and Dictionaries. Of these authorities but one or two go for his favorite version of this passage, and they are not ranked amongst critics. What is the standing of Thomas Scott among biblical critics! A popular commentator is one thing, and a biblical critic another. But I will give all that they ask, and a thousand individuals who are favorable to the name Christian; and what do they prove in this question? Thousands are favorable to the name Christian; so am I, and have always been. But the question is now about the version of Acts xi. 26.—about the divine authority found in the original language of the text.

Our translators are complained of as Episcopalian. We shall, then, hear a few others. And be it observed that translators, as a class of men, are the best authorities. Here are twelve of them on which I have just laid my hands:—

1. *Thompson.* "And the disciples at Antioch first got the name of Christians."

2. *Doddridge.* "And the disciples were first named Christian at Antioch."

3. *Wakefield.* "And the disciples were first called Christians at Antioch."

4. *Anonymous.* "And these disciples were the first that were denominated Christians."

5. *Vulgate.* "And the disciples were at Antioch first named Christians."

6. *An Infidel Version.* "And in Antioch the disciples were first called Christians."

7. *Tyndale.* "The disciples off Antioche wer the fyrst that wer called Christians:"

8. *Old English, printed A. D.* 1606. "The disciples were first called Christians in Antiochia.

9. *A still more ancient version, name lost.* "The disciples of Antioche were the fyrst that were called Christen."

10. French Testament "*De sorte que ce fut a Antioche que les disciples commencerent a etre nommes Chrestians*"—("And it came to pass that it was at Antioch the disciples began to be called Christians.")

11. Arius Montanus. "*Appellarique primum in Antiochia discipulos Christianos*"—("And the disciples were first named Christians at Antioch.")

12. *Beza*, of whom the Evangelist says he was a host—the greatest Greek scholar that ever lived; and on whose *Codex Bezae* he has so much emphasized.* Beza's Latin Testament is in the following words: "*Et discipuli nominarentur primum Antiochia Christiani*"—("And the disciples were named first at Antioch Christians.")

Now I ask, Need we show that these translators were not all Episcopalians, or of any party or age! that they are the united testimony of all Christendom; for with the Vulgate, in this point, agree Luther's, all the German, Spanish, Portuguese and Italian versions, so far as reported to me. Against these is it rational to place a single *Codex Beza*, or such critics as our brother Editors, or any of us; and especially, too, in a matter in which no party principle was involved? In this case, if in any one, they are all impartial disinterested witnesses.

But finally on this head, since some of those authorities quoted by our Editors, sought to introduce the name Christian by a divine authority, founded on such views as have been detailed for some months past in our periodicals, the justly celebrated and truly eminent Hebrew and Greek Lexicographer has noted their reasonings. And what does he say on all the researches of Pierson, Benson, Doddridge, &c.! He introduces a name of unquestioned authority. "Wetsein," says *Parkhurst*, "has abundantly proved that the verb active, *chreematizo*, frequently signifies in the Greek writers *to be named* or *called*. But Doddridge thinks that *chreematisai*, Acts xi. 26., denotes to be named by divine appointment or direction. I cannot, however, find that *the verb ever has this signification*. The passages of scripture to which

* I doubt this prodigious Greek scholarship of Beza. But let him have it all.

the Doctor refers"—(and they are those to which the Evangelist and Detector refer)—"in proof of his interpretation, *do by no means come up to this point.*"—Parkhurst Dict. p. 746.

Are our brethren then prepared to follow the *Codex Beza*, the Evangelist, and Heretic Detector, against the facts, documents, reasonings, and authorities I have adduced in this article!! I cannot believe it.

I attend to no other points at this time which during some eight months past have been printed among us. Those that oppose my former essays are just as easily disposed of by me, as those weightier matters considered on the present occasion. I will stand before the world—before any literary tribunal in the land, and stake my reputation on the principles, facts, and reasonings now delivered. Nor could I have been induced by all that has been written on the subject, nor the triumphant allusions to my silence, to have broken silence at this time, but for one reason. One of our Editors, not the Heretic Detector, seems to me to have commenced a crusade against every name but Christian, and is devising measures in the article subsequent to that quoted to have it imposed on all baptized persons by the warrant of a *divine* authority, *alias* his own reasonings, opinions, &c. In this case silence, with me, becomes a sin. I have, for many years before that Editor was baptized at all, labored in the field of reform against the dogmatically imposing our own opinions upon others, and arrogating to our own reasonings the homage due to divine oracles. And time has strengthened, not weakened the conviction, that in this great point we began right. I cannot then silently stand by, and see the foundation razed on which we have builded so long, for the purpose of giving to his too superficial examinations an authority to which they are not entitled.

The Evangelist, after all, in fact, claims only *probable* evidence; and will he, on this probable evidence, urge upon this community the adoption of his views and opinions as divine oracles! The conclusion of the article quoted from the Evangelist I confess is mysterious, if not ominous. What he means by "timidity and alarm, resentment, and the base passions of pride and anger, wholly unfit a man for marching in the front of a great people," I understand not. Speaks he of himself, or of some other man! After promising to show us still greater things than these new discoveries, as if conscious he had obtained some great escape, he exclaims, "There is deliverance with God for the righteous!" Well, deliver us from the tyranny of imposing on us, in the name of the Lord, what the Lord has never commanded. No man shall do this with me.

While I reprobate from my heart these uncalled-for and unprofitable

debates about words and names, and have shown by a long silence my desire to get rid of them, I will promise silence only so long as similar advantages are not taken of it by others. It is probable that I may not be heard again on this subject for half a year: but I quit this field for the present not with an empty quiver. And while I have been constrained to deal faithfully, and to speak out manfully against the rashness of some, and the too easy convictions of others, I do it with great good will and with Christian feelings, and a desire to maintain the most perfect amity and harmony with all my fellow-laborers. But if any brother will dogmatically propound his views and opinions as a standard of propriety for others, as God respects no man's person, neither will I. Such claims and pretensions as are now being urged, never would have been attempted had I done this at an earlier day.

Father Stone, Father Campbell, and many of our good brethren have long had great respect for the venerable and ancient name Christian: and so have I. But they never sought to impose it on any one. It is, however, but an *earthly* name. There are no *Christians* in heaven —no *Jews* in heaven—no divisive names in heaven. But there are *saints* in heaven, holy brethren, and other designations of great age and of unquestionable divine authority. Abraham and Moses, though no Christians, were saints. Jesus has yet in store a *new name* which he has promised to all his faithful brethren: "I will give him that overcometh a *new name*, which no man knoweth except him who receiveth it." Let us labor for that new and heavenly name.

The Evangelist says, "He that names a people claims them." I have no desire to name any brother, nor do I wish any one to name me for that purpose. We have many scriptural names already. Meanwhile I say, Peace be on all the holy brethren! and "blessed are the peace-makers, for they shall be called the sons of God!" A. C.

NOTE.

DURING the last six months numerous essays were received here on *the Name*. Those for the name *Christian* exclusively, with only one or two exceptions, were written by those who were formerly seeking to be known by that name. Those for the name *Disciples of Christ*, or *Disciples*, none of them exclusively, were from those who never had been committed to the name *Christian*. A number of the former class have appeared in the two periodicals committed to the name, while I recollect to have seen none of the latter in them. I have some curious speculations on these facts, with which I shall not now trouble my readers. If I had not a very high opinion of some of these correspondents, I would be compelled to the conclusion that pure love for the name Christian was not the only object. There is in some instances, indeed, a very considerable tincture or alloy from another source, which is perfectly well understood at Bethany, if no where else. I am persuaded that some are truly conscientious on this subject, and as well persuaded that others have sinister designs. If Paul could say, 'Some, indeed, even from

envy and strife, and some also from good will preach Christ,' I feel myself perfectly warranted in saying, 'Some, indeed, contend for the name Christian from envy and strife, and some also from good will.' But I am glad that the matter is being largely discussed on the side of Christian. The exclusives on that side are so far transcending themselves that they will refute themselves without much help from any other quarter. I have as much to say as I have said, and a little more if necessary, and as much to the point. But once in six months will be enough for me. I must, however, claim a little space in my next for a Cincinnati correspondent on the name *Disciple*, as he has given something new. A. C.

MEETING AT CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA.

On Friday, the 13th of June, agreeably to appointment, the meeting commenced. Of those who labor in the word and teaching there were present, Thomas M. Henley, Albert Anderson, Robert Ferguson, J. M. Bagby, A. B. Walthal, John Richards, R L Coleman, James W. Goss, J. W. Poindexter, A. B. Mac Gruder, Madison Pendleton, William Pendleton, —— Campbell, of Ohio, John D. Ferguson, James Henshall, O. Wilson, Chester Bullard, and Alexander Campbell.

Greater harmony in all public instructions, deliberations for spreading the gospel, and in the cause of education, never obtained in any meeting. Not a discordant note was heard during the whole interview. It was mutual esteem, brotherly kindness, and Christian co operation throughout all our communications.

A deliberative meeting was called on Saturday morning, at which brother Henshall presided. Fifty-six churches were heard from; and were, in some sense, represented by delegates or letter. There was not a general report of the numbers composing the different congregations represented. Those who stated their numbers varied from fifteen to two hundred members each. It would have been desirable to have formed a correct estimate of the number of brethren scattered up and down in this state. But there appears on the part of many churches a singular apathy, remissness, or neglect of this important and interesting item of intelligence.

To quote from a statement of the meeting furnished me by the President:—"The greatest lack is a sufficient number of Evangelists. The churches are both able and willing to sustain more than double the number there is now in the field. Many of the faithful brethren and sisters from different points of the compass were with us; and the vigilance of brethren generally in Charlottesville to accommodate the people, is worthy of special notice. They manifested a liberality, a hospitality which will not soon be forgotten by those who came up to our meeting. All were comfortable, and all were happy.

"The preaching was of an interesting character: the preachers all felt the weight of truth and the value of souls; and this feeling was soon reciprocated by the community of hearers A good impression was doubtless made on the public mind, and numbers went away much relieved, and disabused of the wrong impressions they had received about us. The apparent good was not as extensive as could have been wished. However, eleven persons were persuaded to forsake sin and follow the Lord with them who call upon his name. Others also, after their return home, were immediately immersed.

"The Baptists were particularly friendly, and several of their preachers, in company with the chaplain from the University, were present generally to hear brother Campbell. The brotherly affection, good will, and heavenly esteem which pervaded every heart, and which kindled into a flame of love, we trust will continue to burn in every bosom through this Old Dominion. The cold and indifferent were aroused—the affectionate were rendered more loving and lovely, and the zealous were more and more devoted; in fact, it was a meeting, whether you regard its influence on Charlottesville, or on the brethren generally, long to be remembered."

To the above remarks I will only add two, viz.—Considering that the great majority of the speakers were young men, and that there was a great deal of speaking, for quantity, matter, and manner, I have not heard better preaching at any convention that I have attended, nor have I ever witnessed more genuine hospitality and brotherly affection than at this truly pleasant and most interesting meeting.

During the meeting we were called upon to address the Charlottesville Lyceum, and the Jeffersonian Society of the University of Virginia. The former society was addressed on the question, *Is Moral Philosophy an Inductive Science?* and the latter, on *Has God ever spoken to man?* The first address was written—the latter was extemporaneous. The former is in process of publication by the Lyceum—the latter, having been extemporaneous, it is doubtful whether we can ever collect and arrange it as delivered. An effort, however, may be made.

The meeting closed on Thursday evening. Methought our Baptist friends and preachers in attendance were well pleased with our meeting; and certainly they treated themselves with more justice, and the brethren with more candor, frankness, and general good feeling than has occurred since the days of the Dover Decrees. Will our much and sincerely esteemed brother Broaddus get to heaven and leave those decrees on record among the archives of the Baptist denomination? If he do, brother Semple and he will have some strange talk about that ugly affair. A. C.

News from the Churches.

Erwinton, South Carolina, June 29, 1840.

The truth is spreading, and there are many adversaries. Brother Smith has been preaching in Georgia, and the prospects are encouraging. In some places the Baptists open their meeting houses notwithstanding the opposition of the clergy, and all are anxious to hear. Brother Green was over there, a few days ago, to fill an appointment at a Baptist meeting-house, and four of the ministers came to persuade the people not to hear; when an old Deacon arose and said, 'the members owned the house, and they had a right to allow whom they pleased to preach in it; that it was open for all, but especially for those people *they called* Campbellites.' The four *reverend gentlemen* took their hats and departed, leaving our brother to address the assembly. He made other appointments at other meeting-houses, and was rejoiced at the success of the good cause.

JOSEPH I HAVENER.

Lexington, Missouri, May 5, 1840.

Our preaching brother Gains has just closed a meeting at Richmond, in Ray county, where he immersed 37 persons. He is now holding forth in Lexington to as many as will come to hear him, and no doubt hundreds would come out to obey the Lord if their minds were not so harrowed up by doctrine that Christ and his Apostles never taught.

CARR B. WADDELL.

Perryton, Ohio, June 15, 1840.

A meeting closed near Martinsburg some ten days ago, at which 36 were immersed, and many united with the Disciples that had been immersed before. At this place we have gained some 20 or more in a few months. We number about 40 or 45 at this place, all walking orderly, and regulary meeting the first day of every week. There are about 500 disciples in this (Licking) and Knox counties, and from 50 to 100 in Muskingum The new school Baptists, I believe, have agreed to let any distinguished man among us into their meeting-house in Zanesville. This is a small matter, but yet it is worth something.

Do come over and help us. You have gone almost every where else, and passed us by. We think our turn has most certainly come.* We want something done that will gain the attention of the people. There is a small congregation in Zanesville, who meet every first day to commemorate the death of Christ. ABNER LEMERT.

Bedford, Ohio, June 4, 1840.

The cause of Zion is still progressing in Bedford. Some forty-five have been added to the saved this year, and many more are being added to the congregations in this vicinity.

J. P. ROBISON.

* I have on file at this moment, many such invitations; to which, were I to attend, I would never see my family nor printing-office again. Still I will try to see all that I can.—A. C.

Louisville, Ky, June 22, 1840.

Four days of last week I occupied in preaching in connexion with brother Taffe, in Jeffersonville, Ia. Eighteen additions were the result of our labors May the Lord bless the congregation there, and influence the saints to do all his commandments.

B. F. HALL.

P. S. Yesterday (Lord's day) I immersed two in this city. May the Lord revive his work among us! B. F. H.

Rising Sun, Indiana, June 17, 1840.

The truth is triumphing gloriously in the bounds of my labors. I have immersed 83 since the first of January last, and have assisted in forming three churches, of from 20 to 24 members, in that time, nearly one half of which I have immersed. When I moved to Greensburg, about the last of October, the church numbered about 50 members; they now have about 100—28 by immersion; and the prospect is very good for many more. On the 6th inst. I commenced in the town of Napoleon, Ripley county, where we had five brethren; and in about four days I gave them twelve discourses; in which time 11 were immersed, 8 from other churches; so that a congregation of 24 members was formed upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner stone, resolved to be governed by the word of God. And, praised be the name of the Lord, the ancient gospel, that in Paul's day made of two one new man, or church, has now, of eleven parties in the town of Napoleon, made one new church or body for the habitation of God through the Spirit; yes, they came together from the Roman Catholics, the Lutherans, Episcopalians, Calvinistic Baptists, Arminian Baptists, Methodists, United Brethren, New Lights, Mormons, the church of God, and the world; so that parents and children, husbands and wives, brothers and sisters, Christians and neighbors that the sin of sectarianism had parted asunder in violation of the word of God, have now united in the bonds of peace to the astonishment of sectarians and the world; but the truth of God will prevail although men and devils may oppose; yes, brother, the Lamb shall overcome them, for they that are with him are called, and chosen, and faithful. Let us take courage, and go on in all the work of faith, labor of love, and patience of hope until death, until with the unnumbered millions we join in giving glory to God and to the Lamb, for they are worthy. Amen! J. B NEW.

Lexington, Kentucky, May 13, 1840.

In this city of elegance and taste,—(surrounded with woodland, fields, and shrubbery gardens, variegated with flowers and spread over with the green carpeting of nature, cooled by shades and fanned by the gentle zephyrs; where nature laughs out in all the triumphs of spring)—I sit down to inform you that since my last letter I visited Middletown, where I and our very worthy and excellent brother Helm immersed eleven more—in all, 34. I expect to make Lexington my home for some time, and every day's experience and observation in the good cause for which you have plead so ably, admonishes me more and more of the indispensable necessity of the disciples possessing more love, forbearance, patience, and humility. He that possesses knowledge, argument, and eloquence, does well; but he who has the meekness of Christ, and lets the peace of God, that surpasses knowledge, *rule* in his heart, does better. Without this our profession is but a profession, and worse than a dream. NEWTON SHORT.

Locust Grove, Missouri, May 25, 1840.

Having myself been often refreshed, (and who has not?) by the news from the churches, I am disposed in turn to refresh others. We have a most beautiful and fertile country, a salubrious climate, filled and filling with an honest and industrious population; but the laborers in the *Lord's vineyard* are few, quite few indeed. There is therefore a fine field open here for the enterprising servant of God to win trophies and to gather wages for eternal life. Will not at least some of our pious and capable young brethren embrace this opportunity of doing good, and of becoming polished shafts in the Lord's quiver? There has been some two or three of us for the last three years engaged in sowing the good seed of the kingdom in Upper Missouri, and now the field is whitening to harvest: but O how few are the laborers! On the last Lord's day and day previous in March, brother T. N. Gaines, of Lexington, Mo, and I held a meeting at Richmond, Ray county, when one confessed the Lord. On the Saturday before the third Lord's day in April, brother Gaines returned there, when several more bowed to heaven's eternal King. On Monday night he sent for me to come to his aid, (for we are fellow-helpers one of the other,) where we continued for eight days, when we baptized thirty-six, and planted or constituted a church on the 26th of April, with forty-eight members. Brethren T. M. Allen, F. R. Palmer, T N. Gaines, and myself have visited there since, and when I was last there (a week ago to-day) they numbered upwards of sixty, most of whom have been lately baptized, and they are of the first order of society. Brother Allen, in his trip up from Boon, staid some four days at Independence, (near which brother Palmer lives,) brother Gaines with him, where they enlisted thirty-two. They then visited Liberty in the middle of the week; but it rained so as nearly to disappoint our meeting. The brethren went thence to Richmond, (brother Palmer along;) thence to Lexington, where, up to the time of my leaving, ten had enlisted. On yesterday I was at Barry, in this county, brethren Hyall and Cox being with me, where four were baptized, and brother Young had a few days before baptized ten. I intend to furnish you a list of the churches in Upper Missouri, with their present number—it cannot be short of 500 brethren in La Fayette, Jackson, Clay, and Ray. A. H. F. PAYNE.

Wellsville, Ohio, June 17, 1840

On last Monday we ended a three days' meeting at this place, during which five persons obeyed the gospel. The preaching brethren present were W. Lamphier and his father, H. Jones, and John Whitaker. The power of the gospel was manifest in removing an ocean of prejudice, and in convincing many of the necessity of obedience. We are poor here, as far as this world's goods are concerned; but we are willing to do all in our power for the cause of truth. Can you possibly come over some time this summer and help us?

MAHLON MARTIN.

Bragg's Store, Alabama, May 21, 1840.

God be adored!—On yesterday ten, among the brightest stars in the firmament of our race, came forward and bowed their necks to Messiah's yoke; among whom, God be praised! was my consort.

Sanballat. Can these feeble few build up the dilapidated walls of Zion? Can they fortify themselves? Will they sacrifice for the Lord? Will they revive the stones out of the heaps of sectarianism?

Tobiah. No: if a fox go up he shall break down their walls, and mock their efforts.

Disciples. Hear, O our God! for by the hypocrite, the ungodly, the spiritually proud, we are despised O Lord, turn their reproach upon their own heads, and suffer not their iniquity and sins to be covered; for they have provoked thee much. So let us build the wall, and ask them to walk about Zion, and go round her, and number her towers, and mark well her bulwarks, and consider her palaces, that they may deepond in their work of demolition.

Sanballat. I have already desponded; I have exhausted the contents of my bitter chalice, and yet the work goes on. If it be of God it will prosper. Who can measure arms with Jehovah? Can any break in pieces the materials of this grand superstructure—the church?

Disciples. Thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ!

Brother Campbell, as you have the pleasure of a personal knowledge with many of my neighbors, it might afford you and others a pleasure to know this galaxy. Brother and sister Hobby, and brother Hannah, of Baptist memory, and as worthy people as ever had their eyes open to the corruptions of that church: our beloved friends, and now brethren and sisters, Newport Bragg and consort, E. S. Wiley and consort, E. Bragg, (a lovely youth,) cousin Harriet C. Butler, and my own wife.

A less prophet than Isaiah could foretell much of the future in this section, provided the brethren do their duty—of which there is no doubt.

Brother Barnes poured the full blaze of a fired soul upon the meeting. Show him symptoms of relenting souls, and he kindles into a flame of almost Arminian enthusiasm. Brother Curtis has scattered far and wide the seeds of the gospel over our *prairie* soil.—May God bless Zion!

JAMES A. BUTLER.

Some of these choice spirits are amongst the most esteemed of my Alabama friends. Such spirits as brethren Butler and Barnes ought to put to flight armies of the aliens, and to wax valiant in fight. The Lord bless them and their families! I have long waited for the good news of the submission of sister Butler to the Lord's Anointed May she be a mother in Israel!—A. C.

Pulaski county, Virginia, April 5, 1840.

I have just returned from a tour of the churches in my field of labor. I was accompanied by J. Miller, of East Tennessee, a brother of acceptable and useful talents. About fifteen confessed. At New Castle messengers from seven churches conferred on the best means of promoting the good cause. They report Pulaski county, at Newbern, 85 members; at Shiloh, 85; at Harmony, 67; in Mont, at Roanoak, 37; in Giles, in the bounds of my labors, 30: in Clover Hollow, 27; Sinking Creek, 62: in Botetort, New Castle, 27.

Yesterday and the day before four confessed—two from the Methodists. I hope your school will have, as a part of its object, the education of little girls. I have but one child, a daughter three years old, and I am a widower. This school, from its first mention, has excited with me the strongest assurance of our ultimate success.

CHESTER BULLARD.

Fayetteville, Arkansas, April 20, 1840.

Often have I had my heart gladdened by the cheering and animating accounts of the triumphs of the glorious gospel, given in your periodical. In hope of contributing to the general joy of the brotherhood, I transmit you the following account:—Something like four years ago you published a brief account of the constitution of our congregation on the West Fork of White River. We organized with about 20 members, and had a rapid increase up to 50, principally from the sects, several of whom united more from a blind zeal for friends, than from principle, and in a short time returned to their homes, leaving our number about 40. Three or four of this remaining number have been expelled for immoral behaviour; three dismissed by letter; two dead, leaving about thirty-two. This little handful of disciples have stood amidst storms of opposition, and have been slandered and misrepresented almost beyond exaggeration. The sects have all been united in trying to put down what they call "Campbellism;" but, thank the Lord, the people begin to see and read for themselves. Last Lord's day I immersed twelve into Christ for remission, and two united with us from the Baptists. Prospects still good. O! had we a faithful, zealous, and devoted Evangelist here, what a harvest would shortly be gathered to the Lord!

STEPHEN STRICKLAND.

Huddersfield, (Eng.,) April 2, 1840.

About six weeks ago two were added; one a schoolmaster, and the other a gentleman from Halifax, who came to us unknown and unexpected. For the past two or three years, I and brother H. had intercourse with a young Scotch tea-dealer, who visited this town on business, from Halifax. Our conversation led him to think and talk to his friends at Halifax, one of which was this gentleman, to whom he presented the Essay on the Remission of Sins, the young Scotchman was taken ill, and died about six months ago After his death, Mr. * * read the Essay; was aroused by it, and knowing where it had been procured, came over here with another friend of his, and opened his mind to us, and after a few weeks asked for baptism, Last first day we added seven; three of whom were from Halifax. I expect they will immediately commence assembling with brother F., to keep he Ordinances of Christ's house; edifying one another; and become a pillar of the truth in Halifax.

A young man, added this week, was a member of the Independent Church here. His defection, as they esteem it, has excited general attention, and I assure you no small share of temper has been manifested. I doubt not the wrath of men will be overruled to the Saviour's praise: much patience and meekness will be requisite on our part. J. S.

SUPPOSED HOAX.

The letter signed *J. P. R. Overall*, which appeared in our last number, it is believed will prove to be an electioneering lie. It was set up and presented me in print for the June number. I suspected it, and had it lifted out of the page and set aside. Meanwhile, news from some other quarter arrived favoring the statement of a great accession at Mount Sterling; and accordingly, during my absence at the Charlottesville meeting, it was replaced; and I am sorry to see it in our last number, believing it to be a trick to effect the gubernatorial election. A. C.

HARRODSBURG MEETING.

May 20, 1840.

Beloved of God—Health and peace to you from God and from Jesus our Lord.

We have the pleasure to inform you that our Circular of March 10th has happily been responded to by our brethren throughout the state, in a manner at once honorable to their own profession of the holy gospel, and gratifying unto our feelings. They have attended from all quarters at Harrodsburg, and blest us with their presence, their piety, and their counsel; and now after ten days liberal, enlightened, and delightful intercourse; after many important and interesting disclosures; after having had much light shed upon the great object of our meeting; namely, the furtherance of the interests of religion and literature, we are enabled by the good providence of God our Father, and in accordance with our own deep reverence for him and love for them, to dismiss them in peace, and by the addition to our assembly of forty most interesting conversions, to bring our meeting to a tranquil, pleasing, and successful issue.

For particulars touching the number and condition of the churches that have addressed us by letter, we beg leave to refer you to our minutes. The number of members reported falls a fraction short of ten thousand; but this, we are assured, by information received during the meeting, is not more than one third of the whole number of our brethren residing within the limits of the state of Kentucky, and that therefore a complete census for the next year 1841 will doubtless return at least 30,000 for the whole state. That this may be obtained, and that the objects of our present meeting may be still further advanced, we have appointed a second general meeting, to be held at Harrodsburg in 1841. It will commence on Thursday before the second Lord's day in May, and this all the brethren every where are affectionately and respectfully invited to attend.

In reporting, the churches will please have respect to the following points viz.—The number of brethren in each church; the number of churches in each county; and, if possible, the number of brethren in each county: also, their organization, their past success, their usefulness, and their prospects for the future, with any additional item of information which it may be deemed important to communicate.

Among the occurrences of our meeting we deem it not the least interesting to the public and the brethren to state here, that there were elected for the benefit of all the churches in the state, two Evangelists, John Rogers and J. J. Moss, who are to be sustained, not by the churches, but by the individual contributions of the liberal and bountiful brethren, who either have pledged or may hereafter pledge themselves for the support of this necessary and most interesting embassy.

The business of these public functionaries will be not so much to make converts themselves, as to address the churches which they visit orally, and if possible to arouse the whole profession in Kentucky to their duty, and to exalt them to a higher usefulness, and a divine life, by inculcating upon them the imperious necessity of perfecting, as soon as practicable, their church organization; of applying for their own safety, quietude, and purity, the uniform discipline of Christ; of employing Evangelists; of raising funds for this and other necessary purposes, by an equitable scheme of finance; and of the great obligation of personal perfection in justice, mercy, and the love of God; that, by well-doing, we may put to silence the ignorance of unInstructed men.

Beloved, seeing we anticipate great results from this our mission, we invite you to share with us the burden of sustaining it, by remitting to Dr *Samuel Hatch*, Chairman of the

committee, such a sum of money, or notes, or pledges, as it may appear good to you to contribute for said purposes.

Receive therefore, beloved, for the truth's sake, these the Messengers of the Harrodsburg Church, the pledges of our dearest esteem, the offspring of our highest affection for you in Christ Jesus. And may grace, mercy, and peace from God, rest upon you through Jesus Christ. To him be the glory through all ages in the church. Amen!

Done by order of the Church,

SAMUEL HATCH, *WILLIS H. WINN,*
JOEL P. WILLIAMS, *PHILIP T. ALLIN,*
SAMUEL G. MULLINS, Committee of Harrodsburg Church.

OBITUARY.

ELIZABETH BRISCOE, a mother in Israel, died at her residence in Mercer county, Kentucky, on the 9th of June, after an illness of six weeks, which she bore with Christian fortitude, aged 76 years. She had been a professor of the Christian religion for 50 or 60 years, the greater portion of which time she belonged to the Regular Baptist church. After hearing the reformation she embraced it, and continued a member of the church of Christ at Perryville until her decease. She was a devoted follower of our blessed Lord Never during her well-spent life has she injured the cause she espoused; but her great effort has been to promote peace and good will among mankind Thanks be to God, her spirit has gone to rest in the kind embraces of the glorious Redeemer! S.

FEMALE SEMINARIES.

Brother *Fall*, near Frankfort, Ky.—brother *Fanning*, near Nashville, Te.—brother *Beverly A. Hicks*, near Lexington, Ky—brother *D. S. Burnet*, Mount Healthy, near Cincinnati, Ohio—and brother *T. F. Johnson*, Georgetown, Ky., are now engaged in conducting Female Seminaries. Concerning the last of these, the *Evangelist*, after a eulogium on Woman, says, "We desire to direct the minds of parents to the *Female Institute* at Georgetown, as an academy of the highest order among western educational establishments for females. From inquiry made during a late visit, we learnt that the Institute is flourishing in the highest degree. We avail ourselves of this opportunity to suggest to parents and guardians the propriety of visiting it, nothing else being more likely to assure them of the superior facilities possessed by the Institute for advancing the education of their daughters and wards." The next session commences September 1st. I have learned from some source that about thirty young ladies, in attendance in Georgetown, have, within the last two years, put on Christ; and also, of those under brother Fall, a good many—I think some 12 or 15 in one session. I have not heard from the others. I learn the Baptists are about instituting a rival Female Seminary at Georgetown That is all in harmony with the spirit of the age. An opposition line I have found, in stages at least, is advantageous. If the Female Institute has done so well heretofore, it will still endeavor to do better, and great will be the friction of mind upon mind amongst the young ladies at Georgetown. A. C.

NOTICE.

On Friday before the fourth Lord's day of September, 1840, will commence our annual meeting at Springfield, Illinois. The churches of Christ are invited and urged to attend it by their messengers; and especially their Evangelists, Elders, and Deacons are earnestly requested to attend. We should be pleased to have with us from other states and territories as many as can come. We design particularly to invite the more prominent brethren from Kentucky, Ohio, and Indiana. Our object is to continue together some days in worship—to become acquainted with each other—to strengthen the bonds of fellowship and brotherly affection—to know our numbers—to have as many evangelists in the field of labor as we may be able to support—and to make one united effort to spread the truth through our country.

[Signed by] *B W Stone, John T Jones, Peter Hedenburg, D P Henderson, Henry D Palmer, William Davenport, John Rigdon, D B Hill, and Theophilus Sweet.*

☞ The editors of the Evangelist and Christian Preacher will please give the above notice an insertion in their periodicals. D. B. H.

Errata.—Page 263, line 9 from bottom, for '*orthodozy*' read *orthopraxy*. This is a new coin from the mint of Dr. Wylie, at least I have not before noticed it. Its etymology places it in a just contrast with orthodoxy: for if that consecrated word inticates *thinking* right, orthopraxy will legitimately import *doing* right; and hence, as Mr. Wylie says, *orthopraxy* in the *last dread day* will pass the divine ordeal incomparably better than *orthodoxy*. O! that a zeal for orthopraxy would transcend the zeal for orthodoxy!

For '*lallés*' read *laleo*, in several places; for '*kalleo*' *kaleo*; and for '*kikanon*' read *kikanon*.

COMMUNICATIONS DEFERRED.

My long *critiqûe* on Acts xi. 26. has, I am sorry to say, displaced the Essay on Evidence No 8; Orrin Abbot on Circumcision; A. W. Sweet on the Supremacy of the Messiah; correspondence with Elder Stone; Notice of Debate on Universalism; together with several letters on News from Churches. ☞ Elder Stone's No. 4. is to hand, but his No. 3 has been lost.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

NEW SERIES.

VOLUME IV.——NUMBER IX.

BETHANY, VA. *SEPTEMBER*, 1840.

THOUGHTS ON EVIDENCE—*No. VIII.*

In pursuing the subject of our reflections, we have compared the evidence of sense with human testimony, and considered the relative value and authority of each. It has been shown that the causes which impair the strength of the latter, have precisely the same effect upon the former, and that both owe their credibility to the same circumstance: so that, all things being equal, sensible evidence is not superior to human testimony as a foundation for conviction, and the popular notion that it is so, is fallacious

Men, inconsistent as usual with themselves, do not, however, by any means in the common affairs of life, disparage human testimony. So greatly dependent are they upon it for the greater part of the information they possess, that they often rest upon its assurances with a readiness of assent approaching to credulity. They are accustomed also to refer to its decision matters of the greatest importance affecting even life and property. Trial by jury could exist only by its means. That which is justly regarded as the safeguard of justice and human rights, is based wholly upon the testimony of witnesses. That which is supposed to possess the power of ascertaining truth with the greatest certainty, and which is so seldom found in error, derives all its accuracy and truth from human testimony.

There is, nevertheless, a species of evidence called *circumstantial*, which can in few cases be depended upon as a means of ascertaining facts. This is wholly indirect; embracing nothing which can be considered as true and proper evidence of the main fact to be determined. From a variety of circumstances, all which may have been correctly reported, a judgment is formed respecting another matter of which there is no witness. The judgment here rests immediately, then, not

5. *Vulgate.* "And the disciples were at Antioch first named Christians."

6. *An Infidel Version.* "And in Antioch the disciples were first called Christians."

7. *Tyndale.* "The disciples off Antioche wer the fyrst that wer called Christians:"

8. *Old English, printed A. D.* 1606. "The disciples were first called Christians in Antiochia.

9. *A still more ancient version, name lost.* "The disciples of Antioche were the fyrst that were called Christen."

10. French Testament "*De sorte que ce fut a Antioche que les disciples commencerent a etre nomines Chrestians*"—("And it came to pass that it was at Antioch the disciples began to be called Christians.")

11. Arius Montanus. "*Appellarique primum in Antiochia discipulos Christianos*"—("And the disciples were first named Christians at Antioch.")

12. *Beza*, of whom the Evangelist says he was a host—the greatest Greek scholar that ever lived; and on whose *Codex Bezae* he has so much emphasized.* Beza's Latin Testament is in the following words: "*Et discipuli nominarentur primum Antiochia Christiani*"—("And the disciples were named first at Antioch Christians.")

Now I ask, Need we show that these translators were not all Episcopalians, or of any party or age! that they are the united testimony of all Christendom; for with the Vulgate, in this point, agree Luther's, all the German, Spanish, Portuguese and Italian versions, so far as reported to me. Against these is it rational to place a single *Codex Beza*, or such critics as our brother Editors, or any of us; and especially, too, in a matter in which no party principle was involved? In this case, if in any one, they are all impartial disinterested witnesses.

But finally on this head, since some of those authorities quoted by our Editors, sought to introduce the name Christian by a divine authority, founded on such views as have been detailed for some months past in our periodicals, the justly celebrated and truly eminent Hebrew and Greek Lexicographer has noted their reasonings. And what does he say on all the researches of Pierson, Benson, Doddridge, &c.? He introduces a name of unquestioned authority. "Wetsein," says *Parkhurst*, "has abundantly proved that the verb active, *chreematizo*, frequently signifies in the Greek writers *to be named* or *called*. But Doddridge thinks that *chreematisai*, Acts xi. 26., denotes to be named by divine appointment or direction. I cannot, however, find that *the verb ever has this signification*. The passages of scripture to which

* I doubt this prodigious Greek scholarship of Beza. But let him have it all.

the Doctor refers"—(and they are those to which the Evangelist and Detector refer)—"in proof of his interpretation, *do by no means come up to this point.*"—Parkhurst Dict. p. 746.

Are our brethren then prepared to follow the *Codex Beza*, the Evangelist, and Heretic Detector, against the facts, documents, reasonings, and authorities I have adduced in this article!! I cannot believe it.

I attend to no other points at this time which during some eight months past have been printed among us. Those that oppose my former essays are just as easily disposed of by me, as those weightier matters considered on the present occasion. I will stand before the world—before any literary tribunal in the land, and stake my reputation on the principles, facts, and reasonings now delivered. Nor could I have been induced by all that has been written on the subject, nor the triumphant allusions to my silence, to have broken silence at this time, but for one reason. One of our Editors, not the Heretic Detector, seems to me to have commenced a crusade against every name but Christian, and is devising measures in the article subsequent to that quoted to have it imposed on all baptized persons by the warrant of a *divine* authority, *alias* his own reasonings, opinions, &c. In this case silence, with me, becomes a sin. I have, for many years before that Editor was baptized at all, labored in the field of reform against the dogmatically imposing our own opinions upon others, and arrogating to our own reasonings the homage due to divine oracles. And time has strengthened, not weakened the conviction, that in this great point we began right. I cannot then silently stand by, and see the foundation razed on which we have builded so long, for the purpose of giving to his too superficial examinations an authority to which they are not entitled.

The Evangelist, after all, in fact, claims only *probable* evidence; and will he, on this probable evidence, urge upon this community the adoption of his views and opinions as divine oracles! The conclusion of the article quoted from the Evangelist I confess is mysterious, if not ominous. What he means by "timidity and alarm, resentment, and the base passions of pride and anger, wholly unfit a man for marching in the front of a great people," I understand not. Speaks he of himself, or of some other man! After promising to show us still greater things than these new discoveries, as if conscious he had obtained some great escape, he exclaims, "There is deliverance with God for the righteous!" Well, deliver us from the tyranny of imposing on us, in the name of the Lord, what the Lord has never commanded. No man shall do this with me.

While I reprobate from my heart these uncalled-for and unprofitable

debates about words and names, and have shown by a long silence my desire to get rid of them, I will promise silence only so long as similar advantages are not taken of it by others. It is probable that I may not be heard again on this subject for half a year: but I quit this field for the present not with an empty quiver. And while I have been constrained to deal faithfully, and to speak out manfully against the rashness of some, and the too easy convictions of others, I do it with great good will and with Christian feelings, and a desire to maintain the most perfect amity and harmony with all my fellow-laborers. But if any brother will dogmatically propound his views and opinions as a standard of propriety for others, as God respects no man's person, neither will I. Such claims and pretensions as are now being urged, never would have been attempted had I done this at an earlier day.

Father Stone, Father Campbell, and many of our good brethren have long had great respect for the venerable and ancient name Christian: and so have I. But they never sought to impose it on any one. It is, however, but an *earthly* name. There are no *Christians* in heaven —no *Jews* in heaven—no divisive names in heaven. But there are *saints* in heaven, holy brethren, and other designations of great age and of unquestionable divine authority. Abraham and Moses, though no Christians, were saints. Jesus has yet in store a *new name* which he has promised to all his faithful brethren: "I will give him that overcometh a *new name*, which no man knoweth except him who receiveth it." Let us labor for that new and heavenly name.

The Evangelist says, "He that names a people claims them." I have no desire to name any brother, nor do I wish any one to name me for that purpose. We have many scriptural names already. Meanwhile I say, Peace be on all the holy brethren! and "blessed are the peace-makers, for they shall be called the sons of God!" A. C.

NOTE.

During the last six months numerous essays were received here on *the Name*. Those for the name *Christian* exclusively, with only one or two exceptions, were written by those who were formerly seeking to be known by that name. Those for the name *Disciples of Christ*, or *Disciples*, none of them exclusively, were from those who never had been committed to the name *Christian*. A number of the former class have appeared in the two periodicals committed to the name, while I recollect to have seen none of the latter in them. I have some curious speculations on these facts, with which I shall not now trouble my readers. If I had not a very high opinion of some of these correspondents, I would be compelled to the conclusion that pure love for the name Christian was not the only object. There is in some instances, indeed, a very considerable tincture or alloy from another source, which is perfectly well understood at Bethany, if no where else. I am persuaded that some are truly conscientious on this subject, and as well persuaded that others have sinister designs. If Paul could say, 'Some, indeed, even from

envy and strife, and some also from good will preach Christ,' I feel myself perfectly warranted in saying, 'Some, indeed, contend for the name Christian from envy and strife, and some also from good will.' But I am glad that the matter is being largely discussed on the side of Christian. The exclusives on that side are so far transcending themselves that they will refute themselves without much help from any other quarter. I have as much to say as I have said, and a little more if necessary, and as much to the point. But once in six months will be enough for me. I must, however, claim a little space in my next for a Cincinnati correspondent on the name *Disciple*, as he has given something new. A. C.

MEETING AT CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA.

On Friday, the 13th of June, agreeably to appointment, the meeting commenced. Of those who labor in the word and teaching there were present, Thomas M. Henley, Albert Anderson, Robert Ferguson, J. M. Bagby, A. B. Walthal, John Richards, R. L. Coleman, James W. Goss, J. W. Poindexter, A. B. Mac Gruder, Madison Pendleton, William Pendleton, —— Campbell, of Ohio, John D. Ferguson, James Henshall, O. Wilson, Chester Bullard, and Alexander Campbell.

Greater harmony in all public instructions, deliberations for spreading the gospel, and in the cause of education, never obtained in any meeting. Not a discordant note was heard during the whole interview. It was mutual esteem, brotherly kindness, and Christian co operation throughout all our communications.

A deliberative meeting was called on Saturday morning, at which brother Henshall presided. Fifty-six churches were heard from; and were, in some sense, represented by delegates or letter. There was not a general report of the numbers composing the different congregations represented. Those who stated their numbers varied from fifteen to two hundred members each. It would have been desirable to have formed a correct estimate of the number of brethren scattered up and down in this state. But there appears on the part of many churches a singular apathy, remissness, or neglect of this important and interesting item of intelligence.

To quote from a statement of the meeting furnished me by the President:—"The greatest lack is a sufficient number of Evangelists. The churches are both able and willing to sustain more than double the number there is now in the field. Many of the faithful brethren and sisters from different points of the compass were with us; and the vigilance of brethren generally in Charlottesville to accommodate the people, is worthy of special notice. They manifested a liberality, a hospitality which will not soon be forgotten by those who came up to our meeting. All were comfortable, and all were happy.

"The preaching was of an interesting character: the preachers all felt the weight of truth and the value of souls; and this feeling was soon reciprocated by the community of hearers. A good impression was doubtless made on the public mind, and numbers went away much relieved, and disabused of the wrong impressions they had received about us. The apparent good was not as extensive as could have been wished. However, eleven persons were persuaded to forsake sin and follow the Lord with them who call upon his name. Others also, after their return home, were immediately immersed.

"The Baptists were particularly friendly, and several of their preachers, in company with the chaplain from the University, were present generally to hear brother Campbell. The brotherly affection, good will, and heavenly esteem which pervaded every heart, and which kindled into a flame of love, we trust will continue to burn in every bosom through this Old Dominion. The cold and indifferent were aroused—the affectionate were rendered more loving and lovely, and the zealous were more and more devoted; in fact, it was a meeting, whether you regard its influence on Charlottesville, or on the brethren generally, long to be remembered."

passage in Lev. vi. 1. I have long considered difficult to be reconciled with Moses and Paul on the law of sacrifice; if what I have written be insufficient to clear the difficulty, it devolves upon you.

Your concluding remarks are to me unsatisfactory. You say, "When I speak of sacrifices as propitiatory, or pacifying the Divine Father, (a scriptural idea truly,) I intend no more, as I have explained myself, than opening a way in which his favor might shine forth. The opening a vent for water to flow, is to make it flow; so opening a way for God to be propitious, is making him propitious, in all propriety of language."

I ask my brother, Is propitiating and pacifying the Divine Father *by sacrifice, a scriptural idea truly?* In what part of the Bible is it written? You say you intend no more by these expressfons, than *opening a way in which his favor might shine forth.* I ask, Where do the scriptures declare this to be the intention of Christ's sacrifice? Water obstructed, or dammed up, must have a vent made for it to flow forth. So the favor of God was obstructed, and could not shine forth till a vent was made for it by by the sacrifice or death of Christ. How does this agree with Paul, Heb. ii. 9. "That he by the favor of God might taste death for every man"? Your opinion is, that the death of Christ opened a way for the favor of God to flow, or shine forth. Paul teaches that the favor of God flowed to the world before the death of Christ, and was the reason why he did die. You farther say, "The sacrifice of Christ made God propitious." This is your intention or meaning; but what saith the scripture? Do tell us the difference between the death of Christ *reconciling the Father to us*, (which you reject,) and propitiating him? I understand your views as those stated in the old *orthodox* system. They represent the door of mercy closed by the strong bars of the broken law, and offended justice; and that the death of Christ satisfied law and justice, and opened the door of mercy, that it might flow to the world. Let this be established by the divine scriptures, and I yield to the old orthodoxy.

I thank you for the honor you have done me in requesting me to give your "Christian System" a careful examination, and privately to propose to you my objections, previous to its stereotyped edition. This I will gladly do as I may have opportunity. Do not hurry the work, for I do believe you will see good reasons for correcting a few inaccuracies.

Yours in warm affection,

B. W. STONE.

LETTER TO B. W. STONE.

Brother Stone:

My dear and much respected Sir—Your favor before me reverts to the beginning; and, glancing at numerous points, teaches the necessity of doing one thing at a time, and of doing it well. Your questions and remarks on the legal sacrifices call for a more distinct enunciation of my views on the legal system. Permit me, then, with a reference to your demand, "Do I deny that the law admitted no person worthy of death, or who had forfeited his life by breaking the law, to offer a victim for sin"—I say, permit me in reference to the question to lay down a few propositions:—

Prop. I. The legal institution of sacrifice is but a national dispensation of a previously existing sacrificial system—a system contemporary with the Fall, and indispensable to any fallen man's acceptable approach to God.

Proof.—Abel offered a bloody sacrifice *in faith* two thousand five hundred years before the law. Faith presupposes testimony; and hope a promise. No testimony, no faith. No promise, no hope. Pious Jews may, therefore, like the pious patriarchs Abel, Enoch, Noah, Shem, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Job, &c. &c. have had views superior to the legal economy.

Prop. II. That all the legal sacrifices were for the exclusive benefit of those who were in the Sinaitic covenant with God, and consequently if they broke that covenant and apostatized from God, its sacrificial provisions extended not to them.

Prop. III. The life and death, the blessing and the curse of the law were merely fleshly and temporal, and therefore the virtue of its sacrifice could extend no farther than to temporal life and temporal blessings. When, therefore, a Jew had forfeited these, the sacrificial law had no blessings in store for him. Deut. xxviii. 1–68.

Prop. IV. But, until a man had forfeited these, the legal sacrifices accompanied with repentance, and the previous qualifications, had power to remit all the penalties of that institution, to sanctify its subjects, and to save them from the consequences of transgression. See Lev. vi. 1–7.; xv. 31.; Num. xix. 13.

Prop. V. That while the law of Ten Commands constituted the substance of the Sinaitic covenant to which the sacrifices were annexed in good keeping with the fleshly people who were its subjects, the fleshly privileges that were its blessings, and the fleshly and temporal curses which were its penalties, it wisely and benevolently regarded the overt act only as the violation of its precepts. Hence no

sin under that covenant, but the literal and overt violation of those precepts, could debar a Jew from the benefits of the altar and the priest.

Prop. VI. That no transgression or sin, even that of ignorance, or of mere ceremonial defilement, however trifling, could, without sacrifice, be forgiven. No repentance, nor amendment of life, without shedding of blood, could obtain remission.*

Prop. VII. That the legal institution was typical. Its covenant, altar, priests, victims, "all were but the shadows of good things to come through a greater and more perfect tabernacle." Therefore faith, repentance, baptism, prayer, and all acts of obedience, without the blood of the new institution, cannot obtain the remission of the least sin in the universe of God.

While these seven propositions contain *in extenso* my reply to your emphatic interrogatory, I have other uses for them to which in the sequel I may apply them.

My remarks on your second proposition, viz.—"That legal atonement was made only for sins of ignorance, or legal defilement," you seem to have misunderstood, if I may judge from the question you ask. You did not note my words accurately. You pass by the word *only*, on which my question turns. You call it a new doctrine, &c. On reconsideration you will perceive the error.

But have I not shown from Lev. vi. 1–7. in contrast with Lev. v. 15., that yours is indeed a new doctrine? Have we not, Lev. v. 15., the law for a trespass through ignorance; and also a second general law for any and every sin of ignorance in the 17th and 18th verses of the same chapter, immediately preceding another law for sin-offerings, without a single allusion to sins of ignorance? Nay, verily, but to the contrary: for it is impossible to suppose any of those to be sins of ignorance. This instance, not to cite others, is all-sufficient to show how unscriptural the conclusion of some is, that legal atonement was only for sins of ignorance and ceremonial defilement. I truly admire your candor in giving up Lev. vi. 1–7. as irreconcileable with that system.

I can sympathize with you in your morbid excitement about certain terms—such as *expiation*, *pacified*, *propitiate*, &c., and bear with all good feeling your admonition about living up to my maxim about the pure speech, and the language of Ashdod. I know the reasons of this peculiar sensitiveness on certain terms. It is, believe me, my venerable brother, unhealthy: for in the same breath of complaint against the

* In reference to the 5th and 6th propositions it must be stated, that even when precepts of the second table had been violated, and the covenant so far broken; yet if the transgressor truly repented and forsook his sins, he was pardoned through sacrifice. For example, David, guilty of murder and adultery, was pardoned; and certainly not without sacrifice: for without shedding of blood there is no remission.

word *expiate* as unscriptural, you use the still more unscriptural terms "victim," "ceremonial defilement," &c.—to which terms I make no objection.

But is *expiate* an unscriptural term? Open your Cruden's Concordance, and see the opinion of that greatest of verbal interpreters. Or do you assume that all other renderings than those of King James are unscriptural? Cruden gives *expiation*, Num. xxxv. 33. as the proper term. "The land cannot be cleansed (expiated) of the blood that is shed therein, but by the blood of him that shed it." Macknight also so renders *katharismos*, Heb, i. 3. "When he had expiated our sins, or made expiation for them." *Hilaskomai*, a word found in the Greek of both Testaments, often in the Old, is, by all good Lexicographers, rendered *atone, expiate, propitiate;* so Parkhurst, Greenfield, Robertson, Screvellius, &c. &c. You quote Webster to prove that *expiate* is not scriptural because he defines it "*to atone for;*" and is *to atone for* an unscriptural phrase? What is the difference between "*to atone for*" and "*to make atonement for*"? Please explain to me, for I do not appreciate any. Now are not the words "to make atonement for" of frequent occurrence? You will find them, I think, eight times in a single chapter, (Lev. xvi.) According to Webster, then, *expiate* is a scriptural and proper term! The words *atonement, propitiation*, and *expiaition*, are equally scriptural, being all of them a *current coin* in the hands of all Lexicographers for one and the same class of words, both in the Septuagint and New Testament Greek. So I conclude, and will thank brother Stone to show me any error in this conclusion.

Permit me also, my respected brother, to suggest for your reconsideration a few objections to some points in this letter. Touching a certain matter you request me to read Heb. 9th and 10th chapters, and you say, 'without doubt I will be convinced of my mistake.' Touching that matter, however, it happened there was no mistake by either of us, except your passing without notice the word *only*. But as to this recommendation, I have to say, that I thank my brother Stone for it, and am glad to perceive the high value he places on these chapters, as well as his high estimate of their perspicuity. The Epistle to the Hebrews I committed to memory when a child; I recommitted it when a man; I have repeated it many a hundred times; and yet so enamored am I with it, that I lately spent the greater part of a day in *thinking* upon one or two verses in these two chapters. They afforded me a feast while I rode some forty miles.

Through my delightful musings on this epistle I have come to the conclusion that the reformation has lost much by the unhappy controversy which has made us all so sensitive on sacrifice, atonement, expi-

ation, &c. &c. I am fully persuaded there are some very erroneous opinions and much ignorance among us on the subjects treated of by Paul in this epistle. Therefore I the more cheerfully responded to the call of my venerable brother Stone to discuss some of these subjects. And I earnestly importune the *Father of Lights*, that, with all candor and Christian feeling, these great questions may be reconsidered, and that our brethren may be more enlightened on the Epistle to the Hebrews. But from this episode to return.

You say, "Those sins purged with blood" (and what, I ask, were the sins purged without blood!) "came under one general name—*errors*. Heb. ix. 7." My dear sir, is not this building a castle on one stone! The word rendered *errors*, on which you descant, is found but *once* in the whole New Testament. You reason as follows:—The blood of bulls and goats could not take away *sins;* but they could take away *errors!* This, of course, you would not call speculation! This blood, you repeat, did take away *errors;* but these errors, you admit, are sins of ignorance. And does my brother Stone teach that the blood of bulls and goats had virtue to expiate sins of ignorance—*errors;* but no virtue to expiate other sins. From this I do, indeed, wholly dissent. I do not believe that all the blood of all the animals on earth, were it all poured out at the foot of one altar, could take away one *anoeema*—one sin of ignorance—one of the errors of the people. I do, moreover, regard the contrast between sins and errors to be purely speculative and imaginative. If I am called upon I will prove it by a list of quotations in which those *errors* are called *sins;* and, as such, it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats could atone for, expiate, or cleanse from one of them.

Brother Stone, you will perceive, then, that you have also mistaken me as much as I presume you have Paul, when you ask, Can I say "that the legal sacrifices did take away all their sins?" I never said so, only in the sense of my third proposition. No *sin*, or *error*, ever was taken away, *but as respected temporal blessings and curses*, by all the blood shed from the foundation of the world, except that of the SLAIN LAMB OF GOD. Hence *the transgressions* forgiven, *as respected all legal penalties*, in those who obtained the earthly Canaan, were *redeemed* or *expiated as respected God and conscience by Jesus Christ.* Might I ask you, my dear sir, to read and consider again Heb. ix. 15. Mark these words—"The Mediator" Jesus, *by means* of (his own) *death for the redemption of transgressions*, not transgressors—not sinners, but sins—committed by *the called* under the first or former Testament.

You appear to me equally unfortunate in a former allusion to this chapter, Letter I. page 285. You quote Heb. ix. 22. "And almost all

things by the law are purged with blood, and without shedding of blood there is no remission." Here are two propositions—a general one and a universal one. The one respects *things*—the other respects *persons*. The general one is, "*Almost all* THINGS *are purged with blood*"—the universal one is, '*Without shedding of blood there is no one pardoned*, or *there is no* REMISSION.' You say, one exception of the "almost all *things* purged with blood," is the *person* guilty! A hint to the wise is sufficient.* I trust you will not again ask, Why does my brother Campbell so confidently assert without shedding of blood there never was remission! Does brother Stone teach that *errors* were forgiven through blood, and *sins* without it! Or what means this question—"Could not the penitent offender find mercy and forgiveness by the law of faith, as did Abraham the father of us all?" And was Abraham saved by faith, without blood, without sacrifice—by faith and works, without a sin-offering! Surely my brother forgot himself here. Abraham worshipped always through blood; hence Jesus said, "Abraham *saw my day and was glad*." I have not many objections to your remarks on Lev. xvi. concerning the great national atonement. That concerning *errors* and *sins* in contrast is already noted. Two things are taught in the slain goat and the scape goat—*forgiveness* and *forgetfulness*. "Their sins and their iniquities I will remember no more." They were borne away into the land of forgetfulness by the scape goat; but they were first atoned for by the slain goat.

You wish to find some exception to the "*all sins*" and "*all iniquities*" atoned for, and would make my words concerning a certain character countenance your conclusions. But the character to which I allude was not that day in that congregation. "The man that despised Moses' law," and renounced his mediation, is not by me regarded as one of that immense host, all of whose sins were that day expiated. So that your conclusion receives no countenance from my words.

You ask me another important question near the close of your letter. "Is propitiating and pacifying the Divine Father a scriptural idea?" The language is divine, and of course the idea also. Our heavenly Father is said to be *against evil doers*—to be *angry*, *incensed*, *provoked*—and to be *pacified*, *pleased*, &c. See a notable example of this style Ez. xvi. 63. "When I am pacified toward thee for all that thou hast done"—"Many a time turned he his anger away"—"His anger endureth but for a moment"—"He retaineth not his anger for ever," &c. You can add to these many such sayings. Now Jesus is called OUR PEACE. He is the PRINCE OF PEACE. At his annunciation it was

* By the way, this is a remarkable verse. There is no exception to a universal rule.—*Without shedding of blood there is no one pardoned.* This is not ALMOST *all things;* but it is universal—NO REMISSION.

shouted from heaven, "Glory to God! Peace on earth and good will among men!" &c. This language authorizes the idea that although God is immutable and benevolent, gracious and merciful, and full of compassion, still because of our iniquities he is spoken of as above; and in reference to such bold and correct imagery Jesus Christ is called a Mediator, our peace and propitiation, our mercy-seat; and God set him forth in this style to justify him in showing mercy to sinners. But of all this in its proper place.

As to your allusion to old orthodoxy, I have only to remark, that I go neither for *orthodoxy* nor *heterodoxy*, but for *orthopraxy*. Still I think "old orthodoxy" is just as learned, as respectable, as pious and moral a thing as young heterodoxy. But I advocate neither. I do not adopt nor reject tenets because of nick-names, fashionable or unfashionable. And I am glad that in this, as in a thousand other points, you cordially concur with

Yours with much esteem and affection,

A. C.

P. S. Although our style is diffuse and the points numerous, perhaps this method of glancing at every thing may be more entertaining; but to me it is by no means agreeable. One single point in a letter is enough. If you will now select the points, I will follow. A. C.

A SCRIPTURAL VIEW

OF

CHRISTIAN CHARACTER AND PRIVILEGE.

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 349.]

In the scriptural exhibition of Christian character under consideration, so clearly and distinctly exhibited, section first; we have also an adequate and satisfactory account of its orgin—section second. For—'as many as received him, to them gave *he power* to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name; which were *born*, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man; but *of God*.' For 'of his *own will* begat he us by the *word of truth*, that we should be a kind of first fruits of his creatures.' Hence the greatness and reality of the effect is easily and evidently admissible, when we consider the causes, efficient and instrumental, by which it is produced; namely, the divine will, and the divine word—the word of truth.—'Therefore, if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new: and all things are of God, *who hath reconciled us to himself* by Jesus Christ.' We

need not, therefore, wonder, that genuine Christians should be such characters, both really and relatively, as are described in section first. "For they are God's workmanship, created in Christ Jesus to good works, which God has before ordained, that they should walk in them." Eph. ii. 10. Wherefore, these things being so, it justly follows, that the "co-workers," "who labor in word and doctrine;" that is—in preaching and teaching—should speak as the oracles of God speak:—"not in the words which man's wisdom teaches, but which the Holy Spirit teaches—that God in all things may be glorified through Jesus Christ." 1 Peter iv. 11. & 1 Cor ii. 13. Also, that "the called," whom God has graciously enlightened, convinced, and converted by his word and spirit, should walk worthy of their high vocation. Eph. iv. 1–32. According as his divine power has given them all things that pertain to life and godliness, through the knowledge of him who has called them to glory and virtue: by whom are given to them exceeding great and precious promises; that by these they might be partakers of a divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust. 2 Peter i. 3, 4. Let all such, then, as are convinced by the word of truth, of their guilty, helpless, perishing condition; and of the all-sufficiency and alone-sufficiency of the blood of Christ to cleanse them from all sin; and also of the promised gift and influence of the Holy Spirit, to sanctify them in body, soul, and spirit, from the power and pollution of sin: that is—the love and practice of it. Let *all such* draw near to God with a true heart, sincerely desirous to be for ever saved from the guilt, the love, the practice, and the punishment of sin; with full assurance of faith in the gracious declarations, invitations, and promises of the gospel, respecting the blissful intention and efficacy of the blood and spirit of Christ, effectually and for ever to cleanse and save from the guilt and pollution of sin, all who thus draw near to God through him, in the due use of the means divinely appointed for those happy purposes; and, in so doing, they shall be actually and effectually saved. For thus, in the due use of the divinely appointed means, being justified and sanctified by faith in the blood and spirit of Christ, they have peace with God, and rejoice in hope of his glory. The blood of Christ, through faith in it, makes them clean from the guilt of sin, and keeps them so. 1 John i. 7. So also faith in the promise of the Holy Spirit puts them into possession of his sanctifying influences for every holy purpose. Luke xi. 43.

Now as there is nothing necessary to authorize the believer's most unlimited confidence in the blood and spirit of Christ, for all the requisite purposes of justification and sanctification, but merely the divine declarations and promises; he is, therefore, as such, happily beyond

the reach of discouragement: "for every one that asketh receiveth, and he that seeketh findeth, and to him that knocketh it shall be opened." Wherefore, being thus continually justified and sanctified by faith, he has peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom he has thus received the reconciliation, and so rejoices in hope of the glory of God. O happy man! O blessed character!

Indeed, how can the genuine believer be otherwise than blessed and happy? He sees and realizes, in the light of the divine testimony, the desperate condition in which he lay involved with the whole human family, under the guilt and power of sin, helpless and hopeless; justly exposed to the divine displeasure, being actually fit for nothing else. Also, that God so loved a guilty perishing world in this sad condition, as to give his only begotten Son to suffer for the sins of the world, that whoever believes in him should not perish, but have an everlasting life. That this blessed gospel was not only sent to him, as it is to thousands, who pay no attention to it; but that it pleased God to quicken him by it, when dead in trespasses and sins. Ps. cxix. 49, 50; Eph. ii. 4–7.—so as to become truly desirous of the proposed salvation.—Also, that its provisions are perfectly adapted to his ignorant, guilty, polluted, perishing condition: Christ, the propitious author of it, being, by divine appointment, made wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption to all who receive him.—And that is the unconditional privilege of all that hear the gospel to receive and rest upon him for those blissful purposes, irrespective of any entitling or qualifying condition whatever. Isai. lv. 1–3; John iv. 10–14, and vii. 37, 38; Rev. xxii. 17.—That thus relying on him, he is justified from all things—freely by his grace, through the redemption which he has accomplished. Acts xiii. 38, 39; Rom. iii. 24. And finally—that being thus justified and sanctified, he must and will certainly be glorified. Rom. viii. 28–39. Thus the genuine believer rests in the bosom of the divine love, in the blissful expectation of the glory that shall be revealed—"the salvation ready to be revealed in the last time"—when Christ shall come to be glorified in his saints, and to be admired by all them that believe. This is that pearl of great price, which, when a man has found, he gladly disposes of all that he has that he may enjoy it. Matth. xii. 45, 46. Thus he that believes has the divine testimony in himself, for he has realized it;—namely—"that God has given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son." 1 John v. 10, 11.

T. C.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

MR. LANDIS' REPLY.

"A Brief Reply to the Remarks of Alexander Campbell, in Defence of the Doctrines of Campbellism, American Biblical Repository, for April, 1840, vol. iii page 469—By Rev. *R. W. Landis.*"

SUCH is the title of an article of 12 pages in the July No., 1840, of the American Biblical Repository. In addition to the notes and comments doctrinal and practical made by the editor, Dr. Peters, on so much of my reply as he thought fit to lay before his readers, we have here 12 octavo pages by way of a decent finish of the matter. After informing us of a secret known perhaps only to Mr. Landis himself, viz.—that his "Review of Campbellism had done great good in England and in America," as farther declarative of his own good intentions, and as proof of no bad feelings in the case, he says to Dr. Peters:—

"In respect to the occasion of my furnishing the original essay which was published in the Repository for January and April, 1839, you appear, yourself, to labor under a slight misapprehension. [See your letter to Mr. Campbell, Bib. Repos. April, 1840, p. 470.] My proposal to write for your work was as follows:—I named to you eight or nine different subjects, upon either" [*any*, I presume,] "of which I was willing to furnish an article. Campbellism was the subject selected by yourself, as the most interesting and important, and was accordingly made choice of by me. Hence I could not have had persona resentment to gratify, as Mr. C. has alleged."

Now Dr. Peters proves that he had no bad feelings in the case by presenting Mr. Landis as a volunteer, while Mr. Landis urges the selection upon Dr. Peters in proof of his freedom from any malice in the affair! This is a very convenient and fraternal way of managing the imputation, and of furnishing exculpatory testimony in all such cases.

But, he says, I divided his essay into four chapters, and instead of his own four, I made two out of his first, and wholly "dropped all mention of the second." I was so startled at this assertion that I opened the volumes of the Repository, and found, as I expected, that the gentleman was hard pressed for matter of accusation. If I have not formally written a whole chapter upon his false accusations touching regeneration, I *unanswerably*, as far as he has attempted, at least, replied to his imputations on "water regeneration;" in doing which I said all that I supposed his misrepresentations on that subject demanded

In examining this finishing touch I was curious to observe which of the four points or chapters Mr. Landis would resume with vigor, and attempt to sustain against my defence. I was, indeed, agreeably disappointed in the first, second, third, and fourth; for in no instance does

he attempt farther to discuss any of these points, or to prove a different doctrine. His whole effort consists in abortive attempts to show that he was justified in using certain terms, by adducing some detached and dislocated words and sentences from my writings. This, I repeat, is the entire merit of the twelve pages.

I was in error in one point, in which I am glad to be corrected; and, rude and uncourteous though the manner be, I will nevertheless give Mr. Landis' explanation of it. I had learned some years since, I do not now remember from what source, that Mr. L. was still an advocate for immersion. But he says he is a seceder from the faith of his fathers. His explanation is:—

"In his reply to me in the Harbinger, (to which Mr. C. refers the readers of the Repository,' speaking on this point he makes still stronger declarations. That I might be spared the pain" [merciful man!] "of making this exposure, I wrote to Mr. C., politely requesting him to correct the misstatement; but the letter remains still unacknowledged. In order to neutralize the force of my arguments against his system, Mr. C. says, 'Mr. Landis is an immersed Presbyterian,' and *therefore goes for immersion as baptism.*' 'Then Campbellism is a terrible thing, when even its warmest foes *are constrained, even in the agony of their struggles, to* AFFIRM *all its most peculiar and offensive dogmata,*' pp. 507, 508. Now surely Mr. C. would not employ this language without having examined the subject. He would not affirm that I 'go for immersion as baptism,' and thus '*affirm* all the dogmas of Campbellism,' without such examination; and all his followers therefore believe that he *has* examined the subject. And surely he cannot plead unintentional mistake, as he has even refused to acknowledge a respectful request to correct it. Now I *never* wrote a line advocating immersion as baptism; *and since I have been a Pedobaptist have never advocated that mode of administering the ordinance!* The facts which Mr. C. has thus cruelly distorted are these: My parents were Baptists. I, when very young, united with the Baptist church, and was, of course, immersed. A few years after, and while yet under age, I became convinced that the views of my Baptist brethren respecting the subject and mode of baptism, were erroneous; whereupon I left them and united with the Presbyterian church; *and since that hour I have ever been a strenuous advocate of the views I then embraced.* Such are the facts upon which Mr. C. declares that I 'go for immersion as baptism,' and 'affirm the dogmas' of his system. What would not a controvertist be guilty of, who can coolly and deliberately pervert facts in this manner?"

In all matters in which he can no longer resist, he represents me as having changed my views.

"On pp. 488–9, we have Mr. C.'s *creed.* It was a real pleasure for me to meet with it, for it evinces that he has abandoned many of the strange views formerly held by him. If Mr. C. will only fully return to the theory and practice of the religion of the New Testament, he will find those whom he now regards as his bitterest oppo-

nents, the first to give him a cordial welcome.——But the question here is not what Mr. C. *now* believes, but what he and his sect have heretofore advocated. And that I do not stand alone in my estimate of their *former* sentiments, at least, will appear from the following statements."

"Mr. C.'s distinct denial of Unitarianism, in his answer to my essay, has produced much dissatisfaction in the ranks of his followers. They are about establishing another paper, being extremely displeased with his denial of their tenets. His intimate friend and associate, who has long been a Campbellite, *Barton W. Stone*, well known as a most strenuous Unitarian, has taken measures to revive his own periodical, in which he formerly advocated Unitarianism. He is exceedingly out of humor at the declarations of Mr C. respecting the Unitarians of this sect. And yet Mr. C. would have us believe that he knows of 'not a single Unitarian' in his ranks."

Still he pretends to be in doubt about our Unitarianism:—

"Let us now hear Mr. C. himself. Speaking, in his late work, (to which, by a singular coincidence, he has given the very name which the Socinian Servetus gave to his, three hundred years ago, "*Christianity Restored*," pp. 124, 125, he attributes the leading doctrines in the evangelical system, to the 'excogitations' of men He says, "*Religious philosophers* on the Bible have *excogitated the following* DOCTRINES and philosophical distinctions:—'The Holy Trinity,' 'three persons of *one substance, power, and eternity;*' 'common and special operations of the Holy Ghost,' etc. etc.—'Concerning *these and all such doctrines, and all the speculations and phraseology to which they have given rise, we have the privilege neither to affirm nor deny*—neither to believe nor to doubt—because *God has not proposed them to us in his word*, and there is no command to believe them. Are such sentiments any other than the distinguishing sentiments of avowed Unitarians?"

Yes, of multitudes. Not one of these phrases we censure is within centuries of as old as the gospel. Were all the primitive Christians Unitarians? What trifling! I can show with convincing evidence that any one who believes in, and teaches an "*eternal son*," denies, without, perhaps, intending it, the true and proper divinity of my Saviour; that all the eternal generation and eternal procession speculators are no better than Unitarians of the Channing school, I fearlessly assert. I believe in no supreme nor inferior divinity. My Saviour is *divine*—that is, he is SUPREME.—I have no fellowship with Trinitarian, Unitarian, or Arian speculations. But if there be any one on earth that believes or teaches more fully the *divine supremacy* of my Lord Messiah, or the need, value, and efficacy of his sacrifice for sin and mediation, I would ride a hundred miles to see him. I would not expect to find him in the person of Dr. Peters or the Rev. R. W. Landis!

Touching this singular coincidence in the name "Christianity Re-

stored," I have already stated that I have prefixed no such title to any book written by me. I do not believe Christianity was ever lost. I do not believe in the title RESTORED, applied either to the gospel or Christianity on paper. A *label* put on the back of a book by a book-binder, and the title on the page by the editor, are very far from being identical things.

To complete the old circuit upon a narrow scale he makes an effort to defend himself from the most immoral act in his review—that of representing me as knowingly and wittingly publishing "*several large editions* of the New Version under the *same title.*" I am sorry that he has not elevated his moral character in this attempt any higher than it was before. With an equivocation alike unworthy of a gentleman, of a scholar, and of a professor of religion, he seeks to make the word *several* a fit designation of *two;* and the word *same* to mean *almost alike.* Now the difference of title between the first and the third editions of the New Version is verbally much more than the cause of some of the longest and bloodiest wars in the annals of time. There is in all that he has said on this subject a seemingly deliberate disregard of truth and candor, of that honor and integrity indispensable to moral character, and which, above all men, a Christian minister should display. He has, indeed, been compelled to lay aside some of the more daring obnoxious epithets and assertions; but the attempt to sustain the substance of his misstatements after evident conviction of their injustice and immorality is, to my mind, the most condeming feature of the whole affair.

Mr. L. occupies the fourth part of his last Review on my alleged ignorance of the ecclesiastic standing of Dr. Doddridge. When he shall have read as much biography and history, civil and religious, as his humble servant, he may find that it is in the bounds of possibility, and even probability, that he may forget some such unimportant incident in the life of one of no more renown than P. Doddridge. His display here shows how little he can say in his own defence, and against my views.

My views of faith, regeneration, and the divine and exalted person who is at the head of the New Institution, as well as my effort to give to the community a better version of the New Testament—the four points assailed by these Reverend Reviewers, Messrs. Peters and Landis, I do not think have lost any thing in public esteem in virtue of the fierce onset and savage war of these church militant soldiers of Presbyterianism. To say that I have changed my views, is just as childish and untrue as it is for the lad who argues that the shore is moving rather than the ship which approaches it. These men were

grossly ignorant of my views, and even now they are very imperfectly informed of them. The conceit that reformed Presbyterianism is primitive Christianity, has distempered and jaundiced their vision, and made them appear to those well read in sacred learning as exceedingly impotent in the true knowledge of the truth as it is taught by the holy Apostles. Their rabbinical learning may be respectable for any thing I know to the contrary; but rabbinical lore and divine knowledge, the science of God and of Christ, are as diverse as the mythology of Egypt and the theology of Moses.

They labor under a very unfortunate prejudice against one whom they are constantly assailing. They have wholly mistaken my character and designs, as they have misconceived and misrepresented my views and writings. I have no more enmity or unkind feeling to a Presbyterian than to a Baptist, a Methodist, or any other sectary under the skies. Perhaps I have more partiality for them than for any other party, so far as all my early associations are involved. But they are a haughty, aristocratic, and supercilious people—a good deal like the old Jews, who claimed for themselves "the key of knowledge" and imagined that they are the only true "elect of God." I know, indeed, many very clever preachers and very clever men among that people, for whom I desire to cherish a due respect and benevolence; but I also know some of a different character, to whom I owe more benevolence than reverence. Still as a denomination, I am just on as good terms with them as with any other party in the community. They have, in many instances, treated me with a becoming and an agreeable candor and fairness; and from many of them I have received various acts of kindness. I am glad to add, that, since this controversy began, they have improved as much, especially the new school, as any other party in the land; and many of them have joined, and I doubt not many more of them will join the cause of reformation. For as soon will the decrees, reviews, and inquisitions of ecclesiastics control the shining of the sun, or the return of day at its appointed time, as hinder the truth in its present rapid progress from scattering the mental darkness, prejudice, and error, which so long have enslaved the minds of myriads to the dogmas and mandates of sectarian demagogues. This is the age of Sunday Schools, of Bible Societies, of free inquiry, Lyceums, Debating Schools, and an unshackled Press; and who can rationally fear the issue, the triumph of reason, and truth, and the Bible, over all the schemes, machinations, and doings of placemen and partizan leaders!

As proof of confidence in the cause we espouse, of the strength of truth, and the weight of evidence in our favor, we are willing to appear

in debate any where, on the pages of any periodical, or in any public place in the land. There are two weapons—the tongue and the pen, with which we are ever ready to assail error and defend truth against any one who may think himself in duty bound to assail our views. Will the Biblical Repository allow these remarks a place on its pages? They are contracted to a span, compared with the pages it has allotted Mr. Landis.

To conclude in the words of Mr. Landis—

"More need not be said. Mr. L. knows, of course, what kind of appeals best accords with the taste of his followers, and is most approved by their judgment; and it would be presumptuous, I suppose, to assert, that, in the present controversy, he has not strictly acted in accordance with such knowledge. But be this as it may, I now resign both him and his proceedings to the judgment of an enlightened public." A. C.

"THE NAME."

Dear brother Campbell,

The Apostle James has taught that "every man be swift to hear, slow to speak;" and brother Winans says, that when men are talking boys should keep silence. As no merchant brings wares to market that he himself does not think worthy the attention of his brother merchants, so neither would I be found among the prophets on this question, did I think that the thought herein embodied had been proclaimed by any of the major prophets—the more especially as space has already been pre-occupied by so many of the family of Boanerges.

This is our proposition—*It has always been an act as well as the highest prerogative of authority to impose names, and a prominent feature of subjection to receive them.*

Here let us look back to the history of the beginning, and notice, that what God can alone keep in its proper order and sphere in creation, *he* names,—while that which God puts in subjection to man, *Adam* names. Witness—"And God called (or *named*) the light *Day;* and the darkness he called (or *named*) *Night.* Why? Because God created; and Day and Night are alone subject to him!

Again—"And God called (or *named*) the (visible) firmament, *Heaven.*" "And God called (or *named*) the dry land *Earth;* and the gathering together of the waters called (or *named*) he, *Seas.*" And inasmuch as "language must have come by inspiration," it is evident that "the greater and the lesser light" were named *Sun* and *Moon*, by the great author of language. David says, "He calleth the *Stars* by their names;" or, He giveth to each star its own proper name.

"And God brought every beast of the field and every fowl of the air to Adam, to see what *he* would call (name) them; and whatever Adam called (named) every living creature, that was the name thereof." Why? Because God gave to Adam "dominion (authority) over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the

earth;" thus imparting his own authority to Adam, as in speaking to Moses of Aaron God said, "He shall be to thee instead of a mouth, and thou shalt be to him instead of God."

When God presented our first mother to him from whom she had been made, Adam said, "She shall be called (*named*) Woman;" this being the feminine termination of his own name—*Ish*, in Hebrew, signifying Man; and *Isha*, Woman. (There is another reason why she was called Eve, or *Evah*, which does not belong to our subject.) For Paul teaches "that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man;" and Peter commands "that wives be in *subjection* to their own husbands." The first children that were born on earth, received their names from those who had authority, and to whom they were subject. It was customary for conquerors to name conquered cities and territories after their own names, thus—"Jair, son of Manasseh, took all the country of Argot, unto the coasts of Geshuri and Maachathi, and called them after his own name." Deut. iii. 14. "And Nobah went and took Kenath, and the villages thereof, and called it Nobah, after his own name." Num. xxxiii. 42. This practice obtained extensively among the heathen; and in some cases colonies were left among a subjugated people, to teach them the language of their conquerors, or rulers. God also has changed the name of men and women after they had attained to years of maturity, thus—Abram, Abraham; Sarai, Sarah; Jacob, Israel; &c. thus showing that God still continued to watch over them, in their willing subjection to him. We find again that Daniel and his three brethren of Judah had "names given them by the *Prince* of the Eunuchs," viz:—Belteshazzar, Shadrach, Mechach, and Abednego. Here we see a Prince exercising his authority in "*giving names*" to his captive subjects.

When a child is adopted into a family, it takes the name given by him under whose authority it designs to live; so a woman coming into the relation of wife, adopts the name given by the husband;—so again, a man, wishing to change his name, asks permission of the state, or those in authority:—thus in each case showing the acknowledgment of authority on the one part, and the feature of subjection on the other.

Without consuming more time or room, the above examples (and we could multiply them by *tens*) go to prove the correctness of the proposition advanced at the head of this article.

We now come to the point at issue. Which name has claim to authority? We say emphatically, that on the score of divine authority, all the evidences favor the name *Disciple*, while that of *Christian* has to go a-begging for a parentage.

The appellation of "my disciples" occurs but seven times in the Record—once in the Old, and six times in the New Testament; in each of the latter cases by authority—by the Lord himself; and that in the Old by the Spirit of inspiration, under the promise of Immanuel, viz.—"Bind up the testimony, seal the law among my disciples." Is. viii. 16. While that of Christian, "in the Greek," appears but three times in the whole volume, each certainly wanting evidence of its authoritatively been given. We will quote: "And he (Jesus) said, Go into the city to such a man, and say unto him, The *Master* saith, My time is at hand; I will keep the passover at thy house with *my disciples*." And immediately follows—"And the disciples did as Jesus

had appointed them." Matt. xxvi. 18, 19. Mark uses the same language, ch. xiv. 14. Luke also, ch. xxii. 11.

But lest it should be said that Jesus spoke thus of his Apostles only, let us turn to John viii. 31. "Then said Jesus to those Jews which *believed* on him, If ye *continue* in my *word*, then are ye *my disciples indeed*." John again quoting the language of Jesus, says, ch. xiv. 25. "By this shall all men know that ye are *my disciples*, if ye have love one to another." Once more, Jesus himself, again speaking, ch. xv. 8., "Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be *my disciples*." (Our mind is here involuntarily led to the reflection that the four Evangelists have exhibited with regard to this matter, an unwonted degree of jealousy; thus signifying, we think, that the followers of Jesus down to the remotest age should be as jealous of the name with which the Master has honored them, as men and women are wont to be with regard to their names in society.)

Here we find that the King himself, when speaking of his family or subjects, always uses the name of "disciple;" thus settling, we humbly think, by the highest authority on the one side and the most willing subjection on the other, *the family name*. While the name "Christian" wants the necessary ingredient of authoritative power and honorable parentage in its bestowment.

But it may be objected, that Peter says, "If any man suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed." This we think does not *prove* any thing. It at farthest only shows that the name was used, while we have already shown that individuals, tribes, sects, states, nations, have adopted the name given both by foes and friends, and sometimes those given through ridicule,—witness the Methodists, who now glory in wearing that name which was once given them reproachfully.

In the foregoing we have had recourse only to the English version of the Bible, leaving to the learned the discussion of this topic in its Greek and Hebrew bearings. E. B. H.

Cincinnati, Ohio.

FAMILY CULTURE.

CONVERSATIONS AT THE CARLTON HOUSE.

No. IX.

After reading the eighth and ninth chapters a second time, the conversation was resumed.

Olympas. Tell me, Susan, how many human beings were saved in the Ark?

Susan. Only eight: these were Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth, and their four wives.

Olympas. Of the three sons of Noah who was the first born or eldest?

James. Shem, I presume, because he is always first named.

Olympas. Is that a scriptural rule, that that which is first named is first done, or the person first named is the first born, Eliza?

Eliza. No: for Moses and Aaron prove that the most important and reputable frequently take precedence. Aaron was certainly three years older than Moses; yet Moses is always named first, because most honorable; and so in this case Shem is most certainly younger than Japheth, and yet he is always first named. This is also true of Jacob and Esau.

Olympas. How do you prove, Reuben, that Shem was younger than Japheth?

Reuben. 1st. Because when Moses relates the families of these three, he begins with Japheth, chapter x., proceeds to Ham, and ends with Shem? 2d. Because he calls Japheth *the elder*, chaps. x. xxi. He is said to be older than Shem. According to age it would read Japheth, Ham, and Shem. Often the last in birth is first in rank: as, Moses and Aaron, Jacob and Esau, Paul and Barnabas, Shem, Ham, and Japheth, &c.

Olympas. Is there any allusion to the salvation of Noah and his family in the New Covenant Scriptures, William?

William. Peter says baptism saves us as the ark in the deluge saved Noah.

Olympas. Perhaps you ought not to put the ark alone as the type, but the persons in the ark immersed in the deluge. The antitype, not of the ark, so much as of the persons immersed in it. Baptism doth also now save us who have thus entered into the New Covenant with Christ. Eight persons encased in a wooden chest, submerged in a world of waters, celestial and terrestrial, were indeed a good figure of those who enter into Christ and are immersed into his death. But does not Peter explain the salvation of which he speaks, Reuben?

Reuben. Yes, sir. "It is not," says he, "the putting off of the pollutions of the skin, or of legal defilement, but the answer of a good conscience towards God, through the resurrection of Christ."

Olympas. A good conscience is the effect, not the cause of remission; and baptism is but the means of obtaining it, baptism saves no farther than it secures to us a good conscience. But without remission of sins, or a release from guilt, no person can have a good conscience; and therefore no one is saved from the condemning power of sin, but through faith and obedience according to the stipulations of the New Institution. But, Thomas, in what sense, think you, does baptism save us?

Thomas. It appears to me that if baptism in any sense save us, in that sense the unbaptized cannot be saved. But I do not fully comprehend in what sense it is that baptism saves us; I only believe that it saves in some sense, else Peter would not have said so.

Olympas. Salvation is a good deal like a cure. Of the diseased some are said to be healed and cured that are only partially so. But none are perfectly cured who are not restored to sound and vigorous health. The saved and the cured are not those who are merely getting better, or those who may hereafter be restored to good health, but those who are now healed, actually restored to perfect soundness. This perfect soundness in our moral nature requires a good conscience—an assurance of pardon founded upon the testimony of God—and a perfect reconciliation of heart to God. Now as this state of feeling and spiritual health presupposes a complete practical knowledge of the death, burial, and resurrection of Messiah; and as none can possibly have that deep practical knowledge of the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ but the baptized; so none but they are now wholly saved from sin, and intelligently and cordially reconciled to God.

Thomas. But are there not many baptized who have not this perfect and complete knowledge of the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, and can they be said to be saved in the sense of the Apostle Peter?

Olympas. No more than the unbaptized. He that is baptized without previous faith in Christ, repentance towards God, and intelligence as respects his death, burial, and resurrection, cannot have that spiritual and moral health which constitutes the cure called by Peter *salvation.* But we are getting too much into the antitype of the salvation of Noah by water. Let us look again at Father Noah when the Ark was uncovered.

Thomas. It looked, indeed, very like the opening of a grave. There was no opening of the door, but an uncovering of the roof. Noah and his household seemed to arise from the dead, as those who had been long interred. There was a figurative burial and resurrection in this salvation of Noah.

Olympas. And in another point of view might he not be regarded as one born again?

Thomas. So it would appear to me; for he entered the world again—a new world too—the old having been destroyed.

Olympas. And what, Edward, is the first recorded act of the regenerated Noah?

Edward. He builded an altar unto the Lord.

Olympas. Remember, my good children, that the first building on the new-born earth, after its immersion, was an *altar*—an altar *for the Lord*; and that *altars* are reared *for* Jehovah alone. Let us, then, attend carefully to this circumstance. Tell me, Edward, was this the first altar that was ever built?

Edward. It is the first recorded, but not the first that was built. Cain and Abel, after the example of Adam their father, offered sacrifice; and without an altar nothing can be *offered* to God. Altars and sacrifices are, then, as old as the fall of man. Both worlds began with altars, victims, and priests.

Olympas. Reuben, you are fond of tracing the etymology of words: whence comes the word *altar?*

Reuben. From *altus*, high. Hence the veneration for high places for worship—the peaks of mountains, rocks, and hills. Thus Jacob reared a stone pillar, and Gideon offered a sacrifice upon a table rock.

Olympas. But *altus* is Latin. Altars are older than the Romans. Whence got the Romans the idea?

Reuben. From the Greeks. Their *bomos* signifying *basis*: an elevated basis by which to ascend, was the place of their *thusiasterion*, or altar; which term indicated slaying, or offering sacrifice.

Olympas. And all these from the Hebrew word *mizbeach*, from *zabach*, to slay; *the place for slain sacrifices*, on which they were presented to God. Learn, then, from all this, that *all true religion is founded on sacrifice.* The first thing in Adam's family was the altar. It was also the first thing in Noah's, Abraham's, Jacob's, &c. Where, Thomas, did altars usually stand.

Thomas. Always about the entrance of temples and places of worship. The Jews placed theirs in the outer court, near the entrance; from whom other nations derived the custom.

Olympas. Eliza, did you ever read of an altar in heaven?

Eliza. Yes, I read of a golden altar which stands before God in heaven, Rev. ix. 13.

Olympas. Relate to us all that you know about this altar in heaven.

Eliza. It stands immediately before the throne of God. It has fire upon it, and a cloud of incense towers above it, an angel ministers at it, and the prayers and thanksgivings of the saints are offered on it in a way acceptable to the Lord. Rev. vi. viii. and ix.

Olympas. An altar, then, is essential to acceptable worship in all places and at all times. It was so in the family of Adam; it was so in the family of Noah; it was so in all the families of the Patriarchs and Jews; it is so in heaven. And need I add that it is so in the Christian church. "We," the followers of Christ, "have an *altar*, at which they have no right to eat who serve in the tabernacle." Jesus Christ is our altar, sacrifice, sin-offering, passover, circumcision, prophet, priest, and king. What, Eliza, were the offerings of Noah?

Eliza. "He took of every clean beast and of every clean fowl, and offered burnt offerings on the altar."

Olympas. Enumerate the clean beasts and the clean fowls.

Eliza. The lamb, the kid, the calf—or the sheep, the goat, the bullock, among beasts—the turtle dove and the pigeon, among birds, were only those used in sacrifice. Noah took of them all, and made a rich burnt offering to the Lord.

Olympas. Edward, can you explain the meaning of a *burnt offering?* What saith the law?

Edward. It was wholly consumed by fire. The offerer and the priest shared in other things, but not in this. It was wholly devoted to the Lord.

Olympas. Were the victims put on alive, or after they had been slain?

Edward. Not until their blood was spilt upon the ground.

Olympas. How, James, did the Lord regard this offering of Noah?

James. I do not know.

Olympas. Read again the 21st verse, James.

James. "And the Lord smelled a sweet savor; and the Lord said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake, though the imagination of man's heart be evil from his youth: neither will I again smite any more every thing living, as I have done. While the earth remaineth seed-time and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease."

Olympas Observe then, James, that "*the Lord smelled a sweet savor*" while the burnt offering was consuming on Noah's altar. This phrase means, *the Lord was delighted with this burnt offering.* What, Thomas, do you infer from this?

Thomas. I infer, first, that God had commanded such altars to be built, and such offerings to be made, else he could not have been pleased with it: for he has always rejected the inventions and traditions of men in his worship.

Olympas. And what do you infer, Reuben?

Reuben. I infer that this offering was a type of Christ's offering himself a sacrifice to God, because Paul seems to quote these words. Eph. v. 2.

Olympas. Read the passage, Reuben.

Reuben. "Christ has loved us, and given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God—*for a smeet smelling savor.*"

Olympas. Yes, and let me tell you, Reuben, Paul quotes from the Septuagint Greek the very words found in this passage. These significant words are, *osmen euoodias*—a "sweet smelling savor." Let us, then, sum up the whole:—

1. The first *building* reared on the new earth was an *altar.*

2. The first *blood* that was shed was *sacrificial.*

3. The first *smoke* that ascended from the turf was that of a *burnt offering.*

4. It was offered *to* the Lord, and accepted by him.

5. It superinduced new promises, and secured a new covenant with man.

6. It was certainly a type of Christ's sacrifice for sin, which also was offered to God, and was perfectly acceptable to him, and secured to us a new and better covenant, established on better promises than any before vouchsafed to man. From all of which considerations, and others which may afterwards appear, we learn that, without sacrifice—without bloody sin offerings, there is no access to God by sinful man, nor any communication from God to him. All religion is, therefore, founded on *justice;* for Paul says, God set forth his Son, a mercy seat, or propitiatory through faith in his blood, to exhibit his justice or moral righteousness in forgiving sin. Learn, then, this great lesson, that sinful man can approach God in religion only by sacrifice *express* or *implied.* No man can approach God but through the slain Lamb of God, who taketh away the sin of the world. Do you, William, remember any passage in the visions of heavenly things that corroborates this view?

William. In the Apocalypse, 5th chapter, we read of a Lamb that stood between the throne and the four living creatures, as if it had been slain. To this SLAIN LIVING LAMB the mysterious four and the twenty-four celestial senators fall prostrate, shouting, "Worthy art thou; for thou wast *slain*, and hast *redeemed* us to God *by thy blood.*" To these were added myriads of myriads, and thousands of thousands, in chorus repeating, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and might, and honor, and glory, and blessing!"

Olympas. He is, then, a most worshipful personage! Is he not, William?

William. Yes, for the universe in acclamation shout, "To Him who sits upon the throne and to the Lamb be blessing, and honor, and glory, and strength for ever and ever!"

Olympas. He is the Alpha and the Omega, then; he is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world in promise and in type, and he is the slain Lamb in heaven worshipped for ever and ever. Do you not love such a Saviour as this, my dear children? One who is the ALPHA and the OMEGA, the BEGINNING and the ENDING, the FIRST and the LAST—one whom all in heaven worship in equal strains with the Father that sent him. "To Him that sits upon the throne, even to the Lamb, be ALL glory," &c. He is the brightness of his Father's glory

and the express image of his person. He upholds all things by the word of his power; he made expiation for our sins; he is the Son of God, the Son of Man, Emanuel, Messiah the Lord, our Saviour!

Mrs. Olympas. Some of the family asked me the other day touching that *fourth person* seen walking in the fiery furnace, into which were cast Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, by order of the Chaldean chief. The Pagan King is represented as saying, "I see one like the *Son of God* walking with them in the midst of the fire." 'How,' said they, 'did the wicked king know the *Son of God* in those days.'

Olympas. Had our translators been a little better accomplished for the task given them by King James, the question would not have been asked. It reads exactly as follows:—"*A son of the gods*"—a superhuman or angelic being. *Bar Elohim*, without an article, in the Chaldee, as in the Septuagint, *Huios Theou*, can indicate no more than what the Pagan centurion exclaimed, "Truly this was an extraordinary person—*a son of a god.*"

We have not yet finished the egress of Noah, nor the incidents of that memorable era. There is the covenant with Noah, and certain family incidents, worthy of your attention. O tell me, Susan, are the names of Noah's wife and daughters-in-law given by Moses?

Susan. I asked mother the other day, and she could not tell me the name of Mrs. Noah. Do you know, father?

Olympas. Her name was *Naamah*, the daughter of Enoch, who had been translated.

Thomas. Where shall we find that information?

Olympas. In the book of Jasher.

Thomas. I thought that book was lost.

Olympas. It was; but it is said to be found, and here is a copy of it recently translated. I will read the passage:—"And Noah went and took a wife, and he chose Naamah the daughter of Enoch, and she was five hundred and eighty years old. And Noah was four hundred and ninety-eight years old, when he took Naamah for a wife. And Naamah conceived and bare a son, and he called his name Japheth, saying, God has enlarged me in the earth; and she conceived again and bare a son, and he called his name Shem, saying, God has made me a remnant, to raise up seed in the midst of the earth. And Noah was five hundred and two years old when Naamah bare Shem, and the boys grew up and went in the ways of the Lord, in all that Methuselah and Noah their father taught them." Concerning the pretensions of this work, we may say something again. It is at best only of traditionary authority, and is not entitled to our homage only so far as it corresponds with one who certainly spake as moved by the Holy Spirit.

A. C.

MORALITY OF CHRISTIANS—*No. XXI.*

POLITICS.

THERE is, in my opinion, more national guilt contracted in one presidential canvass, than, on the principle of temporal rewards and punishments, could be compensated by the most virtuous and prosperous reign of a hundred years of a new king Solomon in the person of the successful candidate. Can any one compute the number or the variety of deliberate falsehoods, calumnies, perjuries, blasphemies, and slanders of all sorts, arising from the rival interests, perverted understandings, corrupted hearts, and heated passions of some of the Ins and Outs, and their respective friends and adherents, in their present electioneering campaign? If the aggregate could be given in full tale and character, as contemplated by all the pure and holy celestials looking down upon us, methinks the mighty sum would astound the strongest head, and affright the stoutest heart in the nation. For my part, I have long thought that the right of making so many kings in so few years, is the dearest right ever asserted or maintained by any people, if it must be accompanied with such a train of exaggerated vices and sins as characterize the present and some of the past occasions in the memory of this generation.

The contagion, like the pestilential blast from the desert, seems to pervade the whole community, from the palace to the meanest wigwam—from the present incumbent of the rich saloon, down to the resident of the humblest log cabin of the frontier squatters. All are frenzied with the mania of President-making. Even the church of Christ is agitated by this fierce demon of discord, and men who reciprocate over the memorials of a crucified Saviour the common hopes and joys of immortality, are, so soon as the feast is over, heard muttering or debating about the Whig and Democratic candidates—the prospects of the respective idols of a divided people. Ah me! whither has fled the spirit of our religion, when the expectants of a mansion in the skies will wrangle with each other about the difference between an oak or a pine shingle in the roof of their mouldering cottage, as if it were the star-vaulted ceiling of their eternal dome in heaven. To see men who profess to be on their way to a celestial throne fighting in partizan fury about the waiter at table, in an Inn at which they have stopped for a single breakfast, is sage wisdom and sound discretion compared with the conduct of some who contend with heated zeal for four years of X in preference to four years of Y, in a period of a thousand million of ages. The silver reign of a subtreasurer, or the golden reign of an archtreasurer, is, to the government of

Christ in our hearts, infinitely less than a moment to a million of centuries; or an atom of sand to a million of solar systems. And yet some called Christians freeze into an iceberg in listening to the one, who blaze like a torch in waiting upon the developments of the other.

Ought Christians to take an active part in politics—in the present politics of this country? This is a question of as easy decision as it is of great moral importance. I am decidedly of opinion that they ought not. One of my reasons is, American politics are full of avarice and ambition. They are national and mammoth forms of pride and cupidity; or they are a concentration of selfishness in its most repulsive attributes of "*miney* and *thiney*" at all risks and hazards. Now can there be any thing in its spirit and character more opposite to the spirit and genius of Christianity than the cultivation and display of concentrated selfishness.

The present politics of this country are more purely mercenary than any other politics in any other country, or than the former politics of our own country. They are all about money, banks and their deposits, treasuries, vaults, safes and their keepers, hard money and soft money, light money and heavy money, tariffs, taxes, customs, imposts, credit system and cash system, with their respective functionaries, friends, and supporters. These are the sweet and savory topics of our American politics, which ring in our ears in all corners of our land; and, like the frogs of Egypt in the days of her plagues, they have seized and polluted all places in the land—the palace, the church, the parlor, the bed-chamber, the social hearth, and the family altar.

If "out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh," and if the stream that issues from the lips be an index of the fountain within, then is the heart and soul of the American politicians sold to Mammon, sordid, avaricious, and selfish in the superlative degree. Who can take fire into his bosom and his apparel not be burnt! Who can devote his hours to the secular spirit of this secular age, and not be corrupted with the sordid breathings of the slaves and worshippers of gold! As the greatest of Virginia orators once said of certain of the priesthood, so we may say of all those political partizan leaders:—"They are men of seven principles—five loaves and two fishes." As Satan falsely said of Job, we may truly say of them—Does the politician serve his god for nought! They are all looking every man to his quarter for his gain. Such doubtless are the master spirits of this political war, and they have set the people by the ears for the sake of their own dear idols, which are not the sovereign people, but that to which, as to an end, the sovereign people are the best and wisest means.

Will the men of faith then be duped and gulled by such a silly bait to corrupt their souls with the evil communications of these temporizers—with the evil speakings and foul denunciations of those who seek to build their political fortune and fame on blighting the fairest worth and blasting the brightest name that succumbs not to their dictation or their interests, imaginary or real! Surely, then, the Spirit of God cannot be an inmate in that bosom that exhales so foul a breath, and that delights in words so contrary to the law of love. The spirit of politicians and the spirit of God are as antagonistic as flesh and spirit, as hatred and love, as heaven and hell; and he that would faithfully and truly serve the one, must abjure all allegiance to the other. "*You cannot serve God and Mammon.*" This is but one of many reasons why Christians cannot take an active part in the politics of the present day. Would to God that they would set their affection on the politics of heaven, and leave the politics of earth to those who cannot soar above the Alleghany mountains. A. C.

THE EVANGELIST.

From pledges solemnly made in December last, against hope, I did hope that the Editor of the Evangelist would pursue a different and more affectionate course to the Harbinger and its Editor. That begun hope, fondly cheerished, alas, soon began to wane! But its last lingering ray expired not, till the last Evangelist reached my eye.—The explanations, retractions, and nullifications of past pledges which appear on its pages, have now, at length, razed its last foundation, and scattered all my fond expectations to the winds of heaven. The pretext for this breach, is a certain undescribed communication, which appeared in the last December number of the Harbinger, edited by my father, during my absence from home, and supposed by the Evangelist to allude to him. He avows to the world—"I am bold to assert that a piece of more flagrant injustice and wickedness has not been done any individual in this reformation than is done the Evangelist in the piece in the Harbinger, which I read in Richmond." How definite the description of that piece!

Believe me, courteous reader, I would be sorry to hurt a hair upon the head of the Evangelist, and to my knowledge have never done it in thought, word, or deed. I have had the great misfortune, indeed, in common with many others, to differ from him in opinion, as to the view he has taken and exhibited of certain incidents and events in the history of our co-operation and acquaintance. To this cause he has

himself assigned any misunderstanding between us. But because of this, I do not think that he has any right to speak or publish such things as have occasionally, and especially in his last number appeared against me.

As to the "piece of flagrant injustice and wickedness, &c." above complained of to the world, as accomplished by my instrumentality; I have much to say that I will not now say. Something must be reserved for another tribunal. Meanwhile, so much ought to be said as to discharge me from any blame in the affair.

In the first place then, that piece was not written, printed, nor published by me. In the second place, if it had, I am perfectly free from blame, because the Evangelist is not named in it. And in proof that allusions in it, if such there be to the Evangelist, are not very plain, I urge the fact that my father, under whose editorship it appears, declared to me, that he did not so much as surmise there was in it any allusion whatever to the Editor of the Evangelist.

But the public are informed by the Evangelist that the author was demanded from me, and that an apology for it was expected by him or some of his special friends, and that I refused to give the author, &c. True, I refused to give the author, because of the manner in which it was asked, and because I had no right to give his name at that stage of the affair. And to apologize for the piece *as alluding to the Evangelist*, I could not, for two reasons. 1st. Because I knew not whether the author specially alluded to him; and in the second place, if he had, to apologize for it, would be to injure the Editor of the Evangelist by calling attention to it; for not one in five hundred of my readers could surmise any reference to him, if nothing were said about it; but if an apology were offered, all eyes would be turned to him, and every person would be curious to know why the Editor of the Evangelist should take such a piece to himself. I wrote this to the Evangelist, or to some one who wrote to me for him; saying that but for this I was willing to gratify the Evangelist by some explanation of the matter, and left it with him to say whether such an allusion to the affair would be advisable, and if I mistake not, received for answer, that it was better to make no mention of it. Judge my disappointment, then, in seeing the matter published to the world in the last Evangelist, while I reposed under the persuasion that it was satisfactorily disposed of.

But the world is now informed that the Evangelist notified me that unless I gave up the name to him, he would decline all "religious connexion with the writers, editors and publishers of said piece."—This I have said, was refused, because, in my opinion he had no right, civil, moral, or religious, to make such a demand accompanied by such

a declaration. But now he intimates that "*he wanted the writer's name that he might settle it according to the law of Christ.*" Well, give me leave to say, that if I know any thing of the law of Christ, he had not then, nor has he now, any thing to settle with the writer, editor or publisher, according to the law of Christ, or any other law of reason, custom or right, because:—

1st. The Evangelist is not named in the piece alluded to. And suppose he had been alluded to specially and circumstantially; then,

2nd. The laws and usages of society have decreed in such cases, that application be made by a letter addressed by the aggrieved to the *signature* or person making the allusion through the same paper or channel in which the allusion was found. But that was never done by the Evangelist. He never demanded of the Harbinger nor of the *signature, whether he was alluded to in said piece.*

3rd. And had he addressed the signature attached to the piece, and demanded of him if he *were the character intended in said piece,* and had received for answer, that he was not, then the matter would have probably ended. But had he been informed that he was the identical character depicted in said piece; and had the writer refused to give his name; then, indeed, but not till then, could he, in propriety, have addressed the editor of the Harbinger, or demanded from him his name. And had he done this, and the Harbinger refused, in that case he might have had some pretext for inculpating him; but in the absence of all this, I contend he has nothing to settle, according to moral or Christian law, with that writer or the Harbinger. It is all suspicion, jealousy or surmize, from beginning to end. And even suppose that both the writer and the Harbinger had told him that he was the person so depicted and admonished in said piece, then the question would have been, did he, or did he not, deserve it; or was not the admonition justly and kindly tendered. This would have been to be considered before any blame could attach to any of us.

Permit me then to say, that the whole affair, from the September and December numbers of the Evangelist 1838, up to the present time, is contrary to the law of Christ; and I do hereby enter my solemn protest against the continuance of those unscriptual and unchristian proceedings. They are most evidently unscriptual, because:

1st. Christ says "*Tell it to the church,*" and is not the Evangelist inculpating me and telling it to the world. Why summon me to appear before the tribunal of the public so often, in self-defence. Does the Christian law allow Christians to address the world, and bring all their grievances before it, before they complain to the church! I trow not.

2nd. The subscribers to the Evangelist certainly did not covenant and agree with its editor in the conditions of that work, that it should be used as a rod to chasten me or any public brother, whenever its editor took it into his head that we needed it, according to the law of his suspicions and jealousies. I contend that no editor in this reformation has a right, scriptural or by covenant, to prefer any charge upon his pages, in the least implicating the moral excellence or purity of a brother.

3rd. If speaking evil, one of another, be unscriptural, and if dogmatically affirming our judgment against a brother, without the intervention of any tribunal, be unscriptural, then are these proceedings to be discountenanced and disallowed by all lovers of Christian discipline and good manners.

For these reasons I institute no public defence from any imputations on the pages of the Evangelist, except so much of the one before us, as was necessary to explain to all concerned, why I do not recognize the tribunal before which I am arraigned, as one constituted or authorized by our Lawgiver and Judge. I am a member of the Church of Christ, at Bethany, Va., and a law abiding citizen of the Messiah's Kingdom. To that tribunal I am amenable. The Evangelist, to my mind, is obviously in a very singular dilemma. I have transgressed some law of Christ in the case, or I have not. If I have not, he is culpable for arraigning me before the community for no transgression; and if I have transgressed any law, he is culpable for telling it to the world before he told it to the Church, and for compelling me to appear before a tribunal which the law of our King forbids.

But as we are all apt to be partial judges in our own case, and as I may err in my views of these matters, I hereby inform the Editor of the Evangelist that I will hand over to the Church at Bethany, all the published accusations, from first to last, against me, and call for their examination and report on the whole case. I notify him that either in person or by message or messenger, he may be present to sustain his allegata by any other proof which he may have. The proof sheet of this notice shall be mailed to him during the present month of August, that he may have the earliest opportunity of preparing and furnishing every thing he may wish on the occasion. Of the time when the case shall be examined, he will be duly informed.

Editors and preachers may entertain and express contrary views and opinions on any debateable question that may come in their way, but they have no more right than other men to assail the moral and Christian character of one another before the public, either in word or writing. I may have erred in noticing these things in the public man-

ner that I have done in self defence; but if I have, I shall do so, no more. The Church is to protect her members, as well as to adjudicate and decide all matters referred to her tribunals. To her authority I appeal, and by her decisions I shall be governed in this, and in every similar case. I sincerely desire, and will labor to cultivate and maintain, peace and love with all my brethren, for nothing on earth is more incompatible with the christian profession, and with my own spirit and feelings, than jars and discords among brethren. Satan in this way has long fought against the Messiah and his cause, and has had more success in retarding the cause of truth by such machinations than by any other. May the Lord save us from his wicked devices, and bless all that sincerly love and seek the peace and prosperity of Zion!

A. C.

THE BOOK OF JASHER.

Through the kindness of brother *Alexander S. Gould*, of New York, who, in company with the celebrated *M. Noah*, recently published an elegant edition of the book of Jasher, I have been, by the hand of brother Campbell, of Ohio, presented with a copy of it. This work, with a few exceptions, probably interpolations, bears very clear and decisive marks of a very high antiquity. But a few of its words recognize even the existence of the Chaldean language, as stated by its learned and judicious translator. It was written, if we may judge from the close of its records, not long after the death of Joshua. And besides confirming most of the Bible facts recorded anterior to that date, adds many incidents and particulars not found in the sacred books. Its author is not known: for "*the book of Jasher*" means "*the correct or upright record.*"

Various forgeries under this name have from time to time appeared. This seems to be of a more plausible parentage. Still its claims to any thing but a human origin will not admit of much debate. It has no internal evidence of inspiration; but, like the Epistles of Clemens, Barnabas, and the Shepherd of Hermas, the book of Enoch, and other apocryphal books, Jewish and Christian, it savors not of that peculiar unction which gives to the canonical scriptures an unrivalled claim upon the credence of mankind, and bespeaks for them a candid and reverential hearing.

The following extracts from the translator's preface sets its claims for utility in a fair light before the common reader:—

"The important transactions which are narrated with so remarkable a brevity in the Bible, are, in Jasher, more circumstantially detailed; as in the instance of the murder of Abel by his brother Cain, a particular account is given of the disagreement which preceded it, and of the pretext which Cain sought for the commission of the crime. It appears, also, that when the divine judgment condemned him to wander upon the earth, his wife accompanied him, not to the land of *Nod*,

for nó such place is mentioned; but, from this book it appears that the word *Nod*, in the scripture, has been given for the participle of the verb *noded*,, "to move or wander about." Jasher has it thus:—

'And at that time Cain went forth from the presence of the Lord, from the place where he was; and he went moving and wandering in the land at the east of Eden, he and all belonging to him.'

"In the passage respecting the birth of Cain and abel, three daughters are also mentioned. According to Jasher, the art of writing appears to have been known and practised from the earliest periods; it is stated that Cainan was informed beforehand by God, of the intended destruction of mankind by the flood, which he engraved upon tablets of stone, and preserved amongst his treasures.

"This book contains a more detailed account of the awful circumstances attending the commencement of the flood, and of the conduct of Noah toward the terrified multitude who had assembled about the ark, when the fatal moment had arrived, and their doom was irrevocably fixed."

"Jasher clearly elucidates a number of genealogical and chronological difficulties, which occur in the Bible; an instance is here adduced of the genealogy of Seir, the Horite, upon which the Bible is silent."

"The character of Abraham, for piety, true dignity, and hospitality, appears to stand unrivalled; but the most affecting and beautiful account in this book, is that of Abraham offering up his son Isaac. The mutual affection of the father and son, and their willing devotion and obedience to the commands of their Maker, are so exquisitely described, that the heart of him who can peruse the narrative without being deeply affected, must be callous indeed. The conduct of Sarah, as connected with this unexampled and glorious event, was altogether worthy of the wife of Abraham, and the mother of Isaac. At this time Sarah died at Kireath-arba. Her funeral is described as having been magnificent; and it is expressly mentioned, that it was attended by Shem, the son of Noah, Eber his son, king Abimelech, together with Anar, Ashcol, and Mamre, and other great people of the land."

"The history of Joseph has always been considered one of the most admirable and interesting on record. It is composed in a style of simple and artless eloquence, which touches every feeling heart. A judicious critic has observed, that he considers it a perfect composition. This history, in Jasher, enters more into detail concerning the affairs of Potiphar's wife, Zelicah; Joseph's magnificent procession through the cities of Egypt, on coming into power; the pomp with which he was attended by Pharaoh's chariots, officers, and people, when he went up to meet his father; the affecting scene which then took place, together with other remarkable incidents. This beautiful narrative might justly be entitled, the triumph of virtue and piety; and it is presumed that few can peruse it, unmoved by sentiments of the highest admiration, mixed with the deepest feelings of sympathy. The history of the Israelites during their sojourning in Egypt, contains an account of many interesting particulars not noticed in the Bible. Toward the latter end of this period, Balaam, Job, Jannes, and Jambres, appear to have acted their respective parts in some memorable transactions.

"This book clears up the reference in 2 Samuel, ch. i. by showing

that David, in the commencement of his beautiful elegy on the death of Saul and Jonathan, revived an injunction given by Jacob in his dying charge to his son Judah, contained in Jasher in these words:—'But teach, I pray thee, thy children the use of the bow, and all instruments of war," &c. This goes far to prove the authenticity of the book, as it beautifully clears up what was always considered obscure.

"If commentators upon the Holy Scriptures have sought for illustrations in the works of Homer, Pliny, Herodotus, and other profane writers; if they have anxiously caught at glimmerings among the absurdities of Paganism, and the obscurities of Heathen fables, the translator humbly and respectfully hopes that they will now grant a favorable reception to evidence of an entirely opposite character, which is presented in the book of Jasher.

"He does not recommend it to their notice as a work of inspiration, but as a monument of history, comparatively covered with the ivy of the remotest ages; as a work possessing, in its language, all the characteristic simplicity of patriarchal times; and as such, he conceives it peculiarly calculated to illustrate and confirm the sacred truths handed down to us in the scriptures.

"But in making these observations, he is far from offering it as a perfect record. Like all other ancient writings, (except the inspired volume,) it has in some respects suffered from the consuming hand of time; and there is reason to believe that some additions have been made to it. In fine, it contains a history of the lives and memorable transactions of all the illustrious characters recorded in sacred history, from Adam down to the time of the Elders, who immediately succeeded Joshua."

Such are its claims for a reading. I do not, however, believe that it is that *book of Jasher* referred to in the Old Testament. My reasons, if called for, will be given. A. C.

News from the Churches.

Fayetteville, Arkansas, June 6, 1840.

We are wading through the most unparalleled opposition I have ever witnessed; and the result has been twenty added to our congregation, three from the Baptists, three from the Methodists, and fourteen from the world. On the 4th Lord's day in last month, we immersed three in Madison county, about 30 miles from this place The prospects were quite flattering. S. STRICKLAND.

Charlestown, Indiana, June 24, 1840.

Permit me to inform you that the good cause is progressing in this country. Brother Mavity and myself visited Jackson County, including the fifth Lord's day in May, we reached Rockford—at 3 o'clock we addressed a respectable assembly on the Gospel being the power of God unto salvation unto every one that believes, &c. Two made the good confession, and one came forward, who had been previously immersed. On Monday morning we spoke to the people there for the last time; one more young man confessed Jesus Christ. So four were added to the brethren there At 4 o'clock on Tuesday, some five or six miles from Rockford, we commenced preaching at a Church called Ebenezer, where we proclaimed faithfully until Thursday morning—the result was, sixteen were added to the congregation there, twelve of whom were immersed; from the Baptists four. From there we went on to a protracted meeting, three miles East of Vernon, where we met with our beloved Brother L. H Jameson, who had been preaching there several days, and had immersed two. We united with him the Friday before the first Lord's day in June—eleven more bowed to King Jesus, which made thirteen there; several others united, who had been immersed. Brethren Jameson and Mavty were here in this place including the second Lord's day in this month—two were immersed; on yesterday two

more obeyed the King. The Gospel of Jesus Christ is captivating the minds of the people wonderfully, in spite of all the opposition that can be brought against it by the preachers of Sectarianism. Oh! it is God's power unto salvation.

I had forgotten in the proper place to tell you the success of the gospel in this county, including the two and three Lord's days in May—in New Washington, fifty-nine; Olive Branch, sixteen united with the people of God in the march for the Heavenly Canaan.—May the good Lord bless them! M. COLE

Boon County, Missouri, June 25, 1840.

On the second Lord's day of May, I was in Independence, Jackson County, Missouri. The meeting continued four days. There were thirty-two additions, chiefly by faith and obedience. Among those immersed, was a very respectable lady, who had long been a Presbyterian—a few were also added from the Baptists and Cumberland Presbyterians. Brother F. R Palmer is the Bishop of this congregation—in addition to his services, we had those of Brothers Gaines and Vancamp, of Lexington.

The following Thursday and Friday, Brothers Palmer, Gaines, Payne and myself, were in Richmond, Ray County. During our sojourn here, there were fourteen additions.—In this place, a short time before, Brother Gaines, assisted by Brother Payne, had immersed near fifty. On Saturday morning before the third Lord's day our meeting commenced in Lexington, and continued until Monday We had sixteen additions here.—The cause is advancing in our country—O! that we had a few more efficient preachers. On the fifth Lord's day of May, I was in Mexico, in Audrain County, for the first time, and had a good hearing—one Baptist came forward and took a *free* stand upon the gospel. Last Lord's day we had two additions in Columbia, one by letter, the other by faith and obedience. One also *obeyed* the meeting before. T. M. ALLEN.

Pulaski County, Virginia. July 8, 1840.

After the very profitable interview that we had with the brethren in Charlottesville, we accompanied brother Coleman to Scottsville, where we addressed the people a few times. Two were obedient. Immediately on my return home we addressed a congregation of the citizens of Montgomery, at a meeting house called Bethel, and formed a Church there. Within the last ten days twelve have been recruited, and the prospects are good.

The truth is gaining ground in Wythe. Please forward the Harbinger to Mary D. Crocket, Wytheville, Wythe, Va CHESTER BULLARD.

Pike County, Missouri, July 8, 1840.

We had some additions to the congregations in this section this winter and spring, to wit: Frankfort about twenty-five, Salt Beaver about thirty, one of which was an old soldier of '76, who is about eighty-four or five years of age, who was immersed last Lord's day was two weeks since.

You will please to publish our Annual Meeting for the counties of Rates, Pike, Lincoln and Montgomery, which will be commenced and holden in Louisville, Lincoln County, Illinois, on the Friday before the third Lord's day in September. We truly desire the help of our preaching brethren at that time. SANDY E. JONES.

Henry County, Tennessee, July 9, 1840.

On last Lord's day week I was called on to immerse my *father*, a soldier of the revolution, now between *three score years and ten, and four score years of age*—he has been a member of a Methodist Church, first the *Episcopal*, and since of the *Protestant*, more than fifty years, and nearly forty years a preacher of the gospel. Truth is mighty, and I hope will prevail. The second case On Lord's day, 21st ultimo. I was sent for some ten miles, to go see and baptise Mr. Mark Morgan, of this county, in the 23d year of his age; he had been in a state of severe affliction some nine months. I was intimately acquainted with Mr. Morgan for several years—I frequently conversed with him on the subject of religion while he was a student at school, and always found him *skeptical*.—Such he remained, so far as I could learn, until some fifty hours before his death, when he became penitent, lamented his former course, and desired to be baptized in token of his willingness to submit to the authority of the Saviour. When I got to the place, I found him apparently perfectly in his senses, anxiously waiting for my arrival. Such was his extreme weakness, I only inquired whether it was in obedience to the command of Christ that induced him to desire to receive immersion. He assured me it was. A bath had been procured for the occasion, it was taken into the room by his bed, and with the assistance of some friends, I immersed him in the name of the Lord. Such was his peculiar situation, that the removing of him from his bed to the bath, and back again to bed, threw him into some agony, which, however, did not last long, until he became entirely tranquil both in body and mind. He conversed some with his friends—expressed a willingness to depart, and after a few hours, folding his hands upon his breast, he fell asleep without a struggle or a groan. Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord, from henceforth, yea, saith the Spirit, they rest from their labors and their works do follow them.
THOS. POTTS.

George Town, Kentucky, July 30, 1840.

I have just reached home from a campaign of five weeks, south of Green River. Brother Thomas Smith and myself started in the rain and reached Hopkinsville in six days, (Saturday evening) through wind, rain and heat. On Lord's day morning we commenced operations, and labored four days. Thence at Elkton, twenty miles this way, four days Thence ten miles above Russelsville, two days in rain. Thence at Bowling Green.

three and a half days. Thence at Smith's Grove, near Brother Ford's, three days.—Thence at Glasgow, nine days. We had a most glorious time! We gained one hundred and twenty-nine noble additions to the good cause, and in several places we left matters in one hundred per cent. better condition. Another visit would about complete what was begun in the several places we visited. Two good evangelists could change the face of things in Green River within one year. The brethren are liberal, and are wide awake to a sense of their duty, in regard to the conversion of the world. J. T. JOHNSON.

Martingburg, Knox County, Ohio, August 5, 1840

The cause of the Redeemer of men is still progressing in central Ohio; and notwithstanding the persecution of the sects, the "ancient order of things" is being better understood and better received by the impartial and reflecting part of the community than ever before in this section. We have several large congregations of intelligent disciples in this vicinity; and they are on the increase.

A meeting was held by Brethren Cribfield, Jones, Reed and Sanders, sometime since, near this place, during which, forty-nine were added, and among that number the writer of this. D. M. McCANN.

Salem Township, Monroe County, Ohio, August 12, 1840.

Since I saw you last December I have been engaged in labors and difficulties and struggles of mind and body, which have been often very oppressive, and sometimes seemed to me almost *intolerable* But thanks be to God, our Father, I have so far gotten along, and I do hope, in some good degree, have succeeded in doing his will on earth The good that has been effected by gospel means through the labors of a few devoted brethren, in this region of country, is soul cheering—is full of hope and promise. I shall give only a few prominent facts now, hoping, if the Lord's will, to see you face to face in September. Five churches have been scriptually set in order, selecting their Elders, Deacons, and ordaining them with fasting, prayer, and laying on of hands of the Eldership, in a very solemn, feeling and impressive manner—after a full developement of ordination, and of the duties and responsibilities of the congregations and their servants thus set apart, as laid down in the word of God. Two more have meetings appointed in September, to be thus set in order. Since the first of May, at one meeting at the Rocky Narrows Church, eighteen were buried in baptism; eighty-one reclaimed by confession and restoration. At Salem Church meeting, at my house, ten were immersed. At Antioch, eleven were immersed; eighty-three reclaimed. At Proctor, six immersed. At Ben Fork of Captina, twenty-three immersed; two reclaimed and one received from the Baptist denomination. At these and other churches in this region, two, three, five, &c. &c., have been added at various meetings, during the few months past of this season. What affords me peculiar joy and delight, is, that at the above meetings, such portions of scripture as the Sermon on the Mont, the 12th of Romans, the 3d of Colossians, &c. &c., were fully and earnestly urged on the candidates for eternal life; whether saint or sinner; and affectionate warning given, that unless they were willing, by obedience to all the commandments, to be so transformed by the renewing of their minds, as to prove what is that good and acceptable and perfect will of God—it was worse than folly to make a mock of the institution of the Lord. O! how sweet, how delightful is it to witness—to be a partaker of a deep and powerful excitement of rational immortal beings, after two or three days proclaiming of the gospel, richly seasoned with such teaching! It is indeed, a foretaste of Heaven.

The chief laborers in these various meetings, were brethren Bottomfield, Crist, Palmer, Yoakum, Millison, Spriggs, Atkinson, Gates and Ewing. A. G. EWING.

Centreville, Ky., July 22, 1840.

I was at George Town a few days, embracing the second Lord's day in June last, and immersed four—two also joined by letter. At Paris the third; immersed two—several others added. At Cooper's Run the fourth—I immersed six there on Monday. At Leesburg the first Lord's day in July; one immersion. At George Town again the second; one immersion. At Antioch the third; one immersion. At Cynthiana next day to meet Brother Scott; four in all, but not all yet immersed. J. A. G.

Barnesville, Ohio, July 28, 1840.

I wish you to publish in your August Harbinger that on account of the diciples generally not understanding the object of the co operation meeting, held at Boston, Belmont County, in June last—four congregations only came prepared to act in concert with the design of said meeting, there being present members from five or six other congregations who had not been put in possession of the views of the congregations of which they were members, in relation to the objects of said meeting It was requested by said brethren that the business of said meeting, in relation to co operation, be postponed. It was then agreed that there be a meeting appointed, to be held at John Jarvises, about one and a half miles below Williamsburg, to commence at 10 o'clock on Saturday before the first Lord's day in September next, and to continue for three or four days. It is desired that all the congregations that wish to co operate with their brethren at said meeting, do instruct messengers and send them to said meeting, fully prepared to set forward their wishes and the amount they are willing to dedicate to the purpose of sustaining good and efficient evangelists in the field of labor. It is also desired that said messengers be enabled to report the number of members in their congregations, when organized, &c.

I will just state that the meeting at Boston was conducted in good order, and that six believing penitent persons were immersed, and the prospect very good for more. I will

also say that in some five or six congregations in Belmont and Monroe Counties, that the number of immersions for the last five or six weeks, amounts to between fifty and sixty; and also that the subject of order is becoming the all-engrossing subject among the deciples in this region.

ASBURY GARDNER.

Hanover, Ohio, August 3, 1840.

Since the 18th of January last, seventy-five have been added to the congregation in New Lisbon and prospects good for more

Will you be so kind as to publish the following appointments for brother Henry and myself, and oblige us, as also the brethren with whom we expect to meet?

On the 17th, 18th and 19th of October, at the Dutch Meeting House, near Brother Sowers'. On the 20th and 21st, at the Big Redstone Meeting House On the 23rd, 24th, 25th and 26th, at Jacob's Creek. On the 27th and 28th, at Turky Foot. On the 29th, at Laurel Hill. On the 30th and 31st of October, and on the 1st and 2nd of November, at Somerset. And on the 6th, 7th, 8th and 9th of November, at Shade. We leave it to the brethren to set the time of day.

WESLEY LANPHEAR.

Louisville, Kentucky, June 22.

Brother Taff and myself employed a few days of last week in preaching in Jeffersonville, Ia., in sight of this city. The confession and immersion of eighteen persons, was the result of our joint labors to the Lord in that place. Yesterday (Lord's day) I immersed two in this city, both of whom had just made the good confession They had both been members of the Methodist church. It is astonishing how immersion is gaining ground in this country; some who were immersed in Jeffersonville, had been members to Paidobaptist churches While I was in Nashville last spring, I was told that the Methodists had to immerse twenty-five or twenty-six of their old members. Truth is mighty and will prevail. We scarcely hold a protracted meeting without witnessing the immersion of some Paidobaptists.

B. F. HALL.

From the London Christian Messenger.

Newark, April 27.

You will be pleased to learn that two were baptized and added to the body yesterday.

Leeds, May 7.

The church at Wortley continues to increase slowly. Five persons have lately been added by immersion The brethren have suffered much from want of employment, and trade in general is much depressed.

Wrexham, May 15.

I received a letter from brother J D., a few days ago. He says there is a church of eighteen members at Ashton-under-line. Of these brethren we have not heard before—we hail the good news. One of our brethren in the church here, has just called on me on his return from a Welsh journey. He tells me the brethren are increasing at Newmarket and elsewhere; that sectarian prejudices are giving way, and a marked spirit of inquiry after the truth is evident.

Some say that remission of sins, &c., comes to us through a polluted and corrupt channel, but how can this be, when it is, and has ever been, received directly from the word of God? All those who in faith are immersed for remission, receive it *directly* from God. This to me has been a *sacred channel*, assuredly having brought the blessing.

It is with me a favorite sentiment—*no* testimony, *no* faith. Seeing then the gospel testimony was ONCE confirmed, and is now found pure and entire in the New Testament, what further is necessary, than to believe, repent and obey, in order to enjoy the blessing.

Glasgow, May 22.

Since I wrote you last, I have baptized other six. One on the 26th ult., two on the 27th, and last Lord's day two; all of whom have been added to the church here; and on Monday I baptized a female from Kilsyth, the wife of brother ——, whom I baptized at Kilsyth in October last; but what a change! She was so furious against the truth then, that she was actually going to cut his throat the night he was baptized; but thanks be to God, she, who like Saul of Tarsus was exceedingly mad against us, breathing out threatnings and slaughter against the disciples of God, has also become one of us. The church will now meet in their house. Brother —— is a real disciple. Notwithstanding grievous disaffection at Kilsyth, he stands firm as a rock.

I hear from brother Reid, of Dundee, about twice a week. He is still making good progress. He preaches every first day morning on the evils of priestcraft, to tremendous congregations in the street, and large numbers consequently attend the chapel throughout the day. Two or three are added every week. Last Lord's day he baptized three; one of whom was a Baptist preacher, a Mr ——, and will no doubt be a great assistance to the brethren.

We are requested to state that A. Campbell's Essay on the Remission of sins, in the *Welsh* Language, may be had of Simpkin & Co., price one shilling. Also, that the New Testament, by A. Campbell, translated into the Welsh, is fast progressing through the press. This work has been undertaken by a Particular Baptist of great intelligence and learning, and its completion may be expected in a short time.—Ed.

ANNUAL MEETINGS.

The Churches of Christ, in the counties of Callaway, Boon, Howard, Randolph, Monroe, and Audrain, will hold their Annual Meeting in Fayette, Howard County, Missouri; commencing on Friday before the first Lord's day in October next. It is desirable that all the teaching brethren, with as many others as can, will attend. We expect each Church to send a written communication, stating their number, increase, &c.; and also what they will do towards sustaining Evangelists the ensuing year.

Georgetown, Kentucky, July 8, 1840.

There will be an Annual Meeting held at Dry Run Meeting House, Scott County, Ky., four miles from Georgetown—commencing on Friday before the second Lord's day in September.

BACON COLLEGE, HARRODSBURG, KY.

Faculty.—James Shannon, President and Professor of Mental, Moral and Political Science.—Samuel Hatch, Professor of Natural Science.—Samuel G. Mullins, Professor of Ancient Languages.—Henry H White, Professor of Mathematics and Civil Engineering.—George H. Matthews, Principal of Preparatory School.

The exercises of this Institution will be resumed on the first Monday in September next, and will continue a session of ten months, terminating on the last Friday in June, 1841.

The Trustees have now the pleasure of announcing to the public, the complete organization and highly prosperous condition of Bacon College. During the last session, although the first at this place, it numbered about 100 students from different parts of the United States. Great facilities for acquiring a finished education, both moral and intellectual, they feel assured, are now to be enjoyed at this Institution. This, in connection with the truth, that Harrodsburg, celebrated for its fine Mineral Waters, and characterized by the morality of its citizens, is extensively, and deservedly known to be one of the most salubrious and pleasant places in America, presents in behalf of this College, it is believed, superior claims to the confidence and patronage of the community.

Terms.—Tuition for session of ten months in College Proper, $40—in the Preparatory Department, for Elementary English branches, including Arithmetic, Geography, and English Grammar, $20—for rudiments of Latin, Greek, and Algebra, $20—all to be paid *invariably* in advance, unless for special reasons, indulgence be granted by the Faculty. Boarding in the most respectable families in town, can be had, at from $2 50 to $3 00 per week, according to the season of the year, including washing, light and fuel. In families adjacent to town, the same can be had at $2 00 per week.

For the information of those who may desire to know something in reference to the literary and moral character of President Shannon, the trustees would state from ample credentials they have in their possession, that he was educated at the Belfast Academical, (now Royal,) Institute, Ireland, where he received a medal as being the best Latin scholar in a large class that entered with him, and took the first prize in Greek, the May following—he also took prizes in Mathematics, Moral and Natural Philosophy, and ranked among the first in several studies in which no prizes were awarded.

On leaving College early in 1819, he acted as assistant for 18 months in one of the best private Academies in the north of Ireland, under the conduct of Mr. James Carley, who certifies that "Mr. James Shannon, in teaching Latin, Greek, French, and the various English branches, proved himself an *excellent scholar*, and a very useful teacher, and was, as to his conduct, perfectly correct and unexceptionable."

Shortly afterwards the Presbytery of Monaghan gave him a letter, in which they allude to his character as being fair and unspotted, and assert, that "in his several examinations before them, in Classics, Logic, Moral and Natural Philosophy, he gave proof of *superior extent* and unwearied application."

In 1821 he removed by engagement, from Ireland to Georgia, to take charge of the Sunbury Academy, where he taught 4 years and 3 months and of the high estimation in which he was held there, a letter from H. J. Kipley, Professor for the last 14 years in the Theological Baptist Institution, at Newton, Massachusetts, gives sufficient evidence; he writes "*I have never known a teacher in whose ability and faithfulness so much confidence might be reposed.*" After this he officiated as Pastor of the Augusta Baptist Church, for near 4 years, teaching a private school part of the time. In 1830 he was appointed Professor of Ancient Languages in the University of Georgia, where he remained for 6 years. The Faculty of that Institution thus write of him: "To long experience in the profession of teaching, to which he is ardently attached, *and superior abilities, both natural and acquired*, Professor Shannon adds untiring industry and perseverance, unyielding firmness and energy in the discharge of his duties, and unsuspected integrity, and probity of character." Such testimonials might be multiplied from men of the first standing in Ireland and America, of all denominations—such as Prof. Olin, now President of the Wesleyan University—the Board of Trustees of the Georgia Universi-

ty, among them Judge Clayton, a member of Congress—Dr. Wm. Brantly, new President of the Charleston College, S. C., who writes that "he (Mr. Shannon) will compare advantageously with the best European Scholars," but these are deemed sufficient For the last 4 years he has been President of the Louisiana College, at Jackson, which has been raised to a state of great prosperity under his administration.

Sometime during the next session, a catalogue setting forth the course of studies, &c., will be issued from this Institution.

On the second Friday in November, President Shannon will be duly inaugurated, and will deliver an address on that occasion. The friends and patrons of the College, and the friends of liberal education generally, are invited to attend.

HARRODSBURG, July 6, 1840.

INFANT BAPTISM NOT A SUBSTITUTE FOR CIRCUMCISION.

South Royalton, Niagara County, N. Y., June 3, 1840.

DEAR SIR:—YOUR extensive critical and deep knowledge of the subject of Baptism, induces me to send you my views of the following passage, and ask you to be so kind as to favor me with yours — Acts xxi. 17—26. In this passage five facts strike my mind—viz:

1st. All the believing Jews were zealous of the law; not a few ignorant ones, but the whole, whether they were babes in Christ or teachers in the church. "Thou seest brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe, and they were all zealous of the law."

2nd. A report had been put into circulation, that Paul taught the Jews among the Gentiles not to "circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs."

3rd. James and the elders advised him to do what would convince his brethren that the report was false. "We have four men" said they, "which have a vow on them—and all may know that those things whereof they were informed concerning thee, are nothing."

4th. Paul followed their advice. "Then Paul took the men, and the next day purifying himself with them, entered into the temple to signify the accomplishment of the days of purification."

5th. Long before this, in the great council at Jerusalem, the Apostles and Elders had determined that the Gentile converts should not be circumcised nor follow the customs, "as touching the Gentiles which believe, we have written and concluded that they observe no such thing."

1st. The Jewish Christians continued to circumcise their children, or they would not have been displeased at hearing that Paul taught the Jews among the Gentiles, not to circumcise theirs.

2nd. They must have held the circumcising of their children to be very important, or the report would not have produced so great a move among them.

3rd. James the Lord's brother, and all the Elders at Jerusalem, held the continuation of circumcision among the Jewish Christians to be sacred, or they would not have given Paul the advice they did.

4th. All the believing Jews understood that they were in the covenant that required circumcision, or they would not have continued the practice with so much tenacity.

5th. The Apostles had never taught them that the old church was abolished and a new one formed, in which children had no place, or

they would not have been grieved with Paul when they heard that he taught the same thing.

Paul had never so taught; for if he had done so, he was not the man to deny it.

7th. The doctrine that a new church was formed, in which children have no place, is a late discovery.

Having been brought up in a country, new and wild, I lay no claim to erudition; but as you say truth is your riches, and I am sure if I were handing you gold you would not draw back your hands, and say it does not come from a silken purse, I hope you will receive the above as truth, or show me why it is not true. As you have held public debates and published them to the world, I do not ask you—nay, I cannot expect you to trouble yourself to go over the same ground again; but there are a few small pieces on which you have not been; them if you please, I will walk over with you.

Yours, with much respect,
ORRIN ABBOTT.

—

REPLY TO ORRIN ABBOTT.

My dear Sir,

I HAVE no objection whatever to your five facts. They are all obviously true and important. Of your inferences, the first is indisputable; the second, evident; the third, logical and fair; the fourth, probable, and by me admitted. The last three are not in your premises, but obviously subversive of them. There is one inference you ought to have drawn, which is all-important, and would have prevented the possibility of the last three. That most cardinal of all inferences on your premises, is—that circumcision was not done away to make room for baptism; or, to use the words of the Pedobaptists, *Circumcision is not done away, and baptism come in the room of it.* The assumption that baptism is come in the room of circumcision, is most irrefragably swept from the arena by your third and fourth *facts*, and by your first and third *inferences*. I congratulate you on the triumphant refutation which you have given of that popular sophism. It has long been with me the last of a long chain of arguments against those who graft infant baptism on the stem of infant circumcision. The facts which you state, viz.—that Paul countenanced, and that the Apostles approved of the circumcision of Jewish children so late as the year of our Lord 60, almost thirty years after the ministry of Jesus began, is a volume of demonstration against the notion that infant sprinkling is a divinely instituted substitute for infant circumcision. According to the teaching of the Papists, and some Protestants, Presbyterian, Episcopalian, and Methodistic, the infants of all believing Jews in the Apostles' times, were baptized. But you have proved that they were circumcised. Now if they are to be believed, and you also—(and that you are correct I doubt not)—then how can the one be a substitute for

the other, when both were, according to your party, administered to the same infants!!! I think you have thoroughly maimed infant sprinkling; indeed you have amputated its right leg, and sent it limping through the world on its left foot.

I have a small treatise in hand on this interminable controversy about infant baptism, the identity of circumcision, and baptism, the Jewish and Christian covenants, churches, &c. But in the mean time, you have furnished a most conclusive argument against the three assumed identities—the seals, covenants, and churches. In proving two seals not identical, you have shattered the Pedobaptist column to the ground. And that they are two seals, not one and identical, you have proved from the fact that the *Jewish Christian infants* were circumcised by consent of Paul and all the Apostles, and your brethren assume that they were baptized also. Now, sir, when you settle this point with your brethren, I will settle any other point you may, in your very kind and favorable opinion, refer to my consideration.

Miller, of Princeton, and Kurtze, of Baltimore, are reforming back into the popery of the 8th century. They, indeed, identify themselves with Gregory the Great much more readily than they identity the Jewish and Christian churches. What think you, friend Abbott? They teach that infants, in consequence of the fleshly descent from a professing father, are actually born the first time in Christ's church, and need never to be born again in no sense, neither of water or spirit, to enter into Christ's kingdom in this world. It is a fact! an astounding fact of the year 1840! I wonder not that so many Methodist preachers go back to the Church of England, and so many Episcopalian ministers return to the bosom of the Church of Rome, when Messrs. Miller and Kurtze are gone back to the intelligence of Nicodemus, and to the opinion of Popes Gregory and Sylvester. But I have not time to touch on these points now. Alas for the waywardness of system and the pride of opinion!——Yours benevolently, A. C.

DIFFICULTIES OF A SCEPTIC.

A VERY complimentary epistle was forwarded us some months since, from Lancaster, Ky., too flattering for publication, proposing some difficulties in the writer's way to a full belief of the scriptures of truth. The writer says he has "been an *occasional reader*" of my "debates and periodicals." It is evident he has been but an *occasional* one, else the difficulties complained of would not at this time beset his mind.

The sum of his difficulties are, 1st. The origin of sin and the devil. 2d. The peculiar substance or nature of the soul of man. And, 3d. The difficulty of supposing it mortal and immortal. After these are disposed of there is an intimation of others, and no one could anticipate where a genius so rambling and so well winged with such powers of imagination might stop. It would be a Herculean task to undertake such a circulating series of arithmetical progressions in the airy excursions of one so singularly gifted with the power of making difficulties.

To prove to such a one the sphericity of our earth, the magnitude of the solar system, or the ratios of solar influence, would be as impossible as to make out a sensible genealogy of Satan and of sin, according to his modes of reasoning. I would recommend not an *occasional*, but a *thorough* perusal of the 'Owen and Campbell Debate" on the evidences of Christianity, Butler's Analogy, Leslie's Short Method, and Keith's Demonstration, &c.

To prove *a priori* what this globe might, could, or should have been, and to prove *a priori* what the devil was, and how sin could be introduced, is like an effort to prove hypothetically that darkness is the effect of light, and cold of heat—that evil sprang from good, and good from evil, by a positive act of the demon Necessity! It is a vain and idle effort to reason on such subjects hypothetically. I would submit with all benevolence to the writer of this epistle the following considerations and reflections.

1st. *Moral evil is.* It could not be always; for sin presupposes *creature*, *law*, and *transgression*. Now is not the Mosaic account of its earthly commencement as rational, intelligible, and consistent as any theory—nay, more than any other theory in the world! Let the writer try to make out a more intelligible and consistent theory, and compare it.

2d. Again, could we enter heaven and inquire after its origin in some other world, would not the developments there made leave as many curious questions unanswered as before!

3d. But is not the mode of cavilling at the Mosaic account itself illogical and unfair? The question is, Did Moses write those books that bear his name, and did he write them by divine authority? Jews, Gentiles, Christians, Prophets, Apostles, the world, affirm this. Who can dispute it!!

4th. The authorship of the books is the first point. That cannot be proved nor disproved by hypothetical or *a priori* reasonings. It is a question of fact, and must be decided by *testimony*.

5th. That decided, then the meaning is to be learned not from ima-

gination, nor from creeds and Doctors; but from a careful and candid perusal of the words of the books according to the established laws of language.

6th. Those hypotheses about the soul and Satan, immortality and annihilation, are more absurd than the vortices of Descartes and the hollow spheres of Captain Symmes. It is worse than trifling to descant upon them. Matth. x. 28, has upset and demolished a thousand theorists of that type. When a person doubts whether he has a soul, it is evident he has a very little one, and is not worthy to be reasoned with.

A. C.

WHAT IS EDUCATION?

The great end of education is not to train a man to get a living.—This is plain, because life was given for a higher end than simply of toil for its own prolongation. A comfortable subsistence is indeed very important to the purposes of life, be it what it may. A man half fed, half clothed, and fearing to perish from famine or cold, will be too crushed in spirit to do the proper work of a man. He must be set free from the grasp of want, from the constant pressure of painful sensations—from grinding, ill-reputed toil. Unless a man be trained to a comfortable support his prospects of improvement and happiness are poor. But if his education aims at nothing more, his life will turn to little account.

To educate a man, is to unfold his faculties—to give him the free and full use of his powers, and especially of his best powers. It is first to train the intellect, to give him a love of truth, and to instruct him in the processes by which it may be acquired. It is to train him soundness of judgment, to teach him to weigh evidence, and guard him against the common sources of error. It is to give him a thirst for knowledge, which will keep his faculties in action throughout life. It is to aid him in the study of the outward world, to initiate him into the physical sciences, so that he will understand the principles of his trade or profession, and will be able to comprehend the phenomena that are continually passing before his eyes. It is to make him acquainted with his own nature, to give him that most important means of improvement, self-comprehension.

In the next place to educate a man, is to train his conscience, to give him a quick, keen discernment of the right, to teach him his duty in its great principles and minute applications, to establish in him immoveable principles of action. It is to show him his true position in the world, his true relation to God and his fellow beings, and immutable obligations laid on him by these. It is to inspire him with the idea of perfection, to give him a high moral aim, and to show how this may be maintained in the commonest toils, and how every thing is made to contribute to its accomplishment.

Further, to educate a man in this country, is to make him a good citizen, to establish him in the principles of political science, to make him acquainted with our history, government and laws, to teach him

our great interests as a nation, and the policy by which they are to be advanced, and to impress him deeply with the responsibility, his great trust, his obligations to disinterested patriotism as the citizen of a free State.

Again, to educate a man is to cultivate his imagination and taste, to awaken his sensibility to the beauties of art, to give him the capacity of enjoying the writings of men of genius, to prepare him for the innocent and refined pleasures of literature.

I will only add, that to educate a man is to cultivate his powers of expression, so that he can bring out his thoughts with clearness and strength, and exert a moral influence over his fellow creatures. This is essential to true enjoyment, and improvement of social life.

According to these views, the laboring classes may as yet be said to have few means of education, except those which providence furnishes in the relations, changes, occupations and discipline of life. The great school of life, of Providence, is indeed open to all. But what, I would ask, is done by our public institutions for the education of the mass of the people? In the mechanical nature of our common schools, is it ever proposed to unfold the various faculties of a human being to prepare him for self-improvement through life? Indeed, according to the views of education now given, how defective are our institutions for rich as well as poor, and what a revolution is required in our whole system of training the young? [W. C. Channing, D. D.]

Dr. Channing is one of the most accomplished scholars of the age. Whatever may be said against some of his theological opinions, as heterodox and unfriendly to profound piety and devotion, all must award to him an unrivalled eminence amongst American theologians, in all that constitutes the elegant, correct and accomplished writer.—He has, in my judgment, no superior, probably no equal in this country, as a finished and elegant writer. His views of education are profound and demonstrably correct. A great revolution, greater than one in a thousand imagine, is wanting to adapt the entire course of education to human nature in the period allotted to the formation of the great lineaments of intellectual and moral character. We have this subject under our consideration, with special reference to that great moral and literary institution which we have proposed. I wonder if all the Christian philanthropists are fallen asleep, or are they waiting till after another election before they say to us whether they will allow our institution to stand on paper only, or enable us to commence a great moral seminary for the improvement and developement of man.

A. C.

OBITUARY.

Centreville, Kentucky, July 22, 1840.

A valiant and faithful soldier has fallen—a devoted servant is just summoned to the presence of his God. Our beloved brother Leonard J. Fleming breathed his last this evening, about five o'clock—he died Christian like; calm, resigned and self possessed. On

Saturday the 11th inst., he came to Union, in this vicinage, to attend a meeting—becoming very sick, he retired to the nearest house, the residence of an aged and kind mother in Israel; never more to leave it in the body. He bore his illness with composure and resignation throughout, and died in the enjoyment of his powers, serenely contemplating death, unmoved by the scene "Blessed are the dead that die in the Lord;" he now 'rests from his labors and his works do follow him." I do not know, but I suppose his case was one of congestive fever. Although he suffered much, yet his case was not one of intense pain or suffering, for which we feel, to thank the Lord. Thus has fallen into the tomb, in the prime of manhood and of usefulness, our fellow laborer; in whom was blended the devoted and untiring evangelist, the able minister of the word of God, the affectionate son and brother, the exemplary Christian—deeply do we feel and deplore our loss—but the hope of a joyous meeting when the storms of life are past, comforts and cheers our hearts.

JOHN A. GANO

A good and useful man has fallen in Israel—one of my earliest acquaintances in Kentucky; endeared to me by the Christian and fraternal intimacies of seventeen years. On my first visit to Kentucky, in 1823, I became acquainted with Brother FLEMMING, and every year since only heightened my esteem and affection for him, as a true and faithful brother and fellow laborer in the Lord's vineyard. No man was more enamored with the great principles of reform on their first promulgation in that most favored and genial soil, than he. I do not remember that I ever made a tour through Kentucky, without his kind assistance, presence and congratulations. He was universally beloved, and I presume no man of any creed or party, ever called in question the sincerity of his faith or the cordiality of his devotion to the Lord. His loss will be long felt by all that knew him, but I doubt not he has found a great gain in the bosom of his father and redeemer. May his beloved and bereaved Christian relations and kindred, humbly bow to this mysterious dispensation, "wait the great teacher, Death, and God adore!"

A. C.

DEBATE ON UNIVERSALISM.

THE Debate on Universalism arrived here a few days since, in sheets. Since my return from my visit to Eastern Virginia I have not had time to examine its fidelity. There is an Appendix added of Mr. Skinner's own manufacture. The design of it appears to be to mislead the reader in respect to a note taken from the Appendix to the third edition of my Family Testament. The Appendix is all on one side, as a matter of course, and was needed, at least in the judgment of Mr. S., to perfect what was wanting in his defence. He has also affixed notes to one of my letters, containing comments and assertions which no honorable man would have presumed to do. It is, then, unfaithfully published.—Still, his Notes and Appendix to the contrary notwithstanding, I desire that it may have an extensive circulation.

A. C.

From the New Hampshire Baptist Register.

BREAST THE WAVE, CHRISTIAN.

Breast the wave, Christian,
When it is strongest;
Watch for the day, Christian,
When the night's longest;
Onward and onward still
Be thine endeavor;
The rest that remaineth
Will be forever.

Fight the fight, Christian,
Jesus is o'er thee;
Run the race, Christian,
Heaven is before thee:
He who hath promis'd
Faltereth never;
The love of eternity
Flows on forever.

Lift the eye, Christian,
Just as it closeth;
Raise the heart, Christian,
Ere it reposeth:
Thee from the love of Christ
Nothing shall sever;
Mount when thy work is done;
Praise him forever.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

NEW SERIES.

VOLUME IV.——NUMBER X.

BETHANY, VA. *OCTOBER*, 1840.

DIFFICULTIES IN CHURCHES—*No. IV.*

ON TRIBUNALS.

THE churches of the Protestant community have more or less cherished the idea of various and different tribunals before which to decide cases of discipline. Hence all the varieties of organization and detail of church courts, from that of a Kirk Session up to the General Assembly, and from a Class-Meeting to a General Conference. Congregationalists know no higher tribunal than a single congregation. Baptists are Congregationalists in this point. But these often make the whole congregation, men, women, and children, judges of each and every case that happens in the community. "*Tell it to the church*" with them means, *Tell it to the multitude, and let them judge.* Paul, however, taught the Corinthians to erect tribunals for certain matters, and to set them to judge who were competent to judge in such cases. Now had the Apostles been Regular Baptists, they would have had no court or tribunal but the whole community in all cases. There are, then, diverse tribunals in Christ's church, or, if any one prefer another term, there are different judges before whom parties may appear.—There is first, the "*two or three more*" than the aggressor and the aggrieved, before whom a trespass must sometimes be carried; there are the "secular seats of judicature," filled with judges selected by the parties, or appointed by the church, described by Paul, 1 Cor. vi.; and there is the presbytery or senate of the whole church.

Now the words *Church* and *State* often mean their institutions. To appeal to the State, is to appeal to its tribunals; and to tell a matter to the Church, is to tell it to those appointed by the whole community to hear it. The whole church is not ear, nor eye, nor tongue. There are many offices and officers in a well organized body: so in the church of the Redeemer, there are a few officers, and sometimes many offices.

But a question has arisen of some apparent difficulty, in some churches. It sometimes happens that the parties to a misunderstanding include the major part of the efficient and competent adjudicators of a little community, and that there are none left in whose competence the parties have sufficient confidence. What, then, is to be done? The most common, natural, and indeed scriptural way, is to call for helps from some neighboring communities,—to invite the eldership of one or more churches, either chosen by the parties or appointed by the church to which they belong. Indeed, there is no other way in which the church, in some cases, could possibly settle some matters.

The authority of such a tribunal, is either found in the selection of the parties who give it, or in the power of the church herself to choose and appoint it. But unless the scriptures sanction such a reference, and call for aid, it will lack divine authority. What, then, it will be asked, is the scriptural warrant for such a tribunal? We answer, it is found first in the constitution of the church itself. The church is one body, composed of many communities, which, from the very law of their being, make them subordinate to one another in every thing that the common interests of the whole community may require. Like individual members of one particular congregation, they are subject to the call of one another, and are bound to submit to one another in all cases demanding their action or co-operation.

But, in the second place, the example of the apostolic churches sanctions such a reference of difficulties to other communities chosen by the particular congregation having special jurisdiction in the case. Thus the church in Antioch having some difficulties with certain Judaizers, "*determined*" to refer the matter to the Apostles, and Elders of the Jerusalem church. In thus *determining*, the Antiochans were influenced by their reasonings on the constitution of the Christian church, or by the direction of the Apostles Paul and Barnabas. To us, however, it is all one whether they acted from the nature of the New Constitution, or from the precept of the Apostles. From one or other, or both, they must have acted; and it is enough for us to know that the church so "*determined*" and so acted under the approval of our great Apostle, who on the occasion condescended to be the delegate of the congregation.

In forming a just and accurate conception of this illustrious example, it is both necessary and expedient that we do not confound the action of the church in Antioch with the proceedings in Jerusalem. Whatever any one may call the meeting in Jerusalem—a Court, a Council, a Conference, or an Association—it matters not. That is very different from the principle or precept in Christianity which compelled and

authorized the Syrian church to go from home and to ask help in that emergency. The church discussed the matter at home, and decided to call for help. This is a fact indisputable. And this is all we ask. The point is therefore fixed that a church in one place may ask help from a church in another place; and that the decision of the matter is then to be regarded as the decision of the particular church having jurisdiction in the case. Thus the exclusion or the censure of an individual member of the church in Antioch, on account of any of those points referred to, after the decision of the matters in Jerusalem, would have been, by the authority of the church in Antioch as much as if no such reference had been made.

I am desirous to be understood on this point because of its importance in reference to the present exigencies of the Christian communities. Many of them are weak and eminently disqualified to decide some intricate and perplexing cases that do and may occur. As a relief from such perplexities, and as a protection from the discords and strifes which may follow certain cases of discipline, it is essential that there be some escape from weakness, prejudice, and mal-administration. This is found in the constitution of the Christian church and in the practice of the primitive disciples; and we have not only a right, but are in duty bound to follow their example in similar emergencies. But it may become our duty more fully to develope these principles on some other occasion: meantime, we are only specifying the tribunals of the Christian institution, before which matters of difference or of wrong are to be tried. These are, the advisory council of "two or three more," before whom the aggrieved calls the aggressor in cases of private trespass; the secular seats of judicature in temporal affairs, appointed by the parties or the church; and the eldership of the church by themselves, or the eldership of a church assisted by the eldership of one or more neighboring communities. Beyond these tribunals we know of no one scripturally or rationally claiming jurisdiction in any ecclesiastical affairs. A. C.

THE ADVANTAGES OF THE PRESS.

Brother Campbell,

That we moderns have attained to a perfection wholly unknown to the ancients, is a sentiment I believe universally entertained; at least I do not remember ever to have heard any one seriously attempt to controvert it. There appears to be something so attractive in the proposition itself, that every one is resolved to be upon the affirmative as soon as they hear it. This is doubtless because every one feels

himself flattered by its adoption. No one is obliged, however, according to our laws, to disparage or condemn himself, as would unavoidably be done by the adoption of the negative, nor is it possible to refer the case to the decision of any other judges. For our ancestors, as a matter of course, know just as little about it as our posterity. The former died too soon: the latter will be born too late. The former could only know and judge for themselves, and they have already exercised the privilege; while the latter, when they come to years of discretion, will unquestionably follow their and our example. Thus, while every age decides for itself this interesting question in the affirmative, a good opinion of ourselves, adopted, *nem. con.*, becomes the perpetual inheritance of the human family, and descends, like an heir-loom, from generation to generation.

All this being so, it is quite unnecessary for me to particularize the various inventions, improvements, and advantages so often adduced as confirmatory of this proposition, which, of itself, may be said to be, if not in a logical, at least in a literal sense, *self*-evident; that is to say, evident to ourselves; a point, above which, logic itself in vain attempts to rise. Suffice it to say, therefore, in general terms, that such are the revolutions effected in modern times by our discoveries in nature, science, and art; by the concentration and application of mechanical power; by the force of steam; and, though last, not least, the influence of the Press, that the conviction is gaining ground every day that we are near the very apex of the highest pinnacle of sublunary perfection; or, to use another figure, that we have so completely stripped the tree of knowledge that posterity will have scarcely a single fruit left to gather for themselves. It may in addition, however, be remarked here that it is esteemed not the least of our modern improvements, nor the weakest of the evidences of our perfection, that either the effect of partaking of this tree, or the quality of the fruit, has become wholly changed. At first it occasioned a consciousness of want and nakedness, and a feeling of timidity and shame. But in modern days, the more people know, the more they think of themselves, and are but the more assured that they are "rich and increased with goods, and have need of nothing." This is especially remarkable in those who happen to make a new discovery, or add in the least degree to the inventions of the age. Even if it be a matter which was known to the ancients, they are not the less proud than if they had invented it themselves. And should it be but the proper application of a phrase, or the true definition of a single word in one of our old writers, they esteem themselves the greatest benefactors of mankind. Nay, they conceive that they have rendered themselves illustrious by merely appropriating and

carrying out the discoveries of others, so difficult has it at length become to invent any thing original or new.

From all the above premises, then, it is finally deduced by way of corollary, that we must certainly have come, if not to the end of the world, at least to the beginning of the end. And this is a subject which I should be glad to see more fully discussed upon the pages of the *Millennial Harbinger*. I was in hopes that the Reformed Clergyman, who, like the wise servant in the captured city, has been prudently looking to the West rather than to the East, would by this time have first discovered the rising of the sun. For I am sometimes afraid, unless the Millennium shall forthwith commence, as predicted by some of our modern prophets, who, in clearness and certainty, far excel the ancient ones, that even we ourselves shall lose caste with our posterity, who will begin to think that we know nothing about the matter, and that we have come not to the beginning of the end, but only to the end of the beginning.

Meanwhile, that something may be said upon the subject, I wish to submit to consideration some reflections upon the advantages which we enjoy above our ancestors by virtue of the art of printing as now amended and improved.

The facility and rapidity with which compositions can now be diffused by the aid of the press are truly astonishing, and constitute a common theme of admiration. The mighty influence which printing has had, and now exerts, upon the condition of the world, is mainly attributable to these circumstances, in which we far excel all past ages. What a labor it must have been in old times to transcribe every work by hand! How bulky and voluminous the compositions of the ancients! How slow and limited their diffusion! The three hundred volumes which we are told Epicurus left behind him would have been a burden for an ass. How much more the four hundred and ninety books of Varro, or the four thousand of Didymus the grammarian! Nor could the prolific Origen fully express himself until he had written six thousand treatises! I presume the world never, before the invention of printing, possessed better means of preserving and spreading knowledge than in the days of Solomon. Books, it seems, were at this time highly valued; and there was then, as at present, so great a rage for book-making, that there was no end to it, if we may so understand the close of Ecclesiastes. It might be thought, however, a much more natural construction of this passage to consider it an expression of impatience; and more reasonable to suppose that Solomon found dictating and writing such a laborious and tedious business, that he got tired of it at last; and that, after he had compiled his three

thousand proverbs, and his thousand and five songs, together with his vast works upon Botany, Zoology, Ornithology, Entomology, and Ichthyology; finding it so difficult to impart all his wisdom, and that all were to be written over again every time a copy was wanted, he exclaimed in a pet, "Of making many books there is no end, and much study is a weariness of the flesh," and so brought the whole matter to a close. Perhaps, too, it might be said, he had by this time become so proficient in that science in which also we so far surpass the ancients, and which consists mainly in a knowledge of the prudential precept, 'Make the women your friends,' now commonly recommended as a golden rule to young men setting out in life, that he began to see that he might have spared himself the trouble of writing so many proverbs, by making this a substitute for them all. Not to mention that his time was becoming too much occupied in the practice of this injunction, in waiting upon the worship of Ashtoreth the Zidonian goddess, and of Milcom the god of the Amorites; or in building high places for Chemosh, Molech, and a thousand other idols of his own favorite idols. Besides, it might be added, it would have been useless for a man to write proverbs who was making a proverb of himself. But in justice to the memory of this wise king, I must reject such hypotheses, inasmuch as it is evident from the context that he intended on this occasion to sum up all wisdom, and all knowledge of the art of human happiness in a far more excellent precept, to wit—"Fear God, and keep his commandments." Nevertheless, it is sufficiently apparent that he regarded the knowledge of this precept a great relief to the labor of making so many books, and the weariness of studying them.

Upon the whole, then, there can be no doubt that the facilities which the moderns enjoy of transferring their ideas to paper, and putting them into a permanent form, are far superior to any ever before enjoyed by men. So rapid is the process, that, as we are told, the greater part of speeches of members of the British Parliament is often reported, put in type, printed and published before the whole of it is even delivered by the speaker. In fact, I can compare it to nothing but the singular effect of the "northern air," of which one of the English poets speaks, by which people's words were said to be congealed and reduced to solidity as fast as they could be uttered. I have not indeed, I confess, in all my researches been as yet able to learn the name of the country in which this happens. That hot water, if cast into the air, will descend in ice, in the northern part of Russia, in the winter season, we are duly informed. But in what climate and at what degree below zero the above circumstance occurs, I pretend not to say. I conclude, however, that the poet has taken a very *high latitude* for it. Be this

as it may, this curious incident admirably illustrates the value of the printing art, which can, with almost equal rapidity, and in every climate, put into a tangible form the words of the statesman and the orator. It might be granted, indeed, that the above mentioned frozen species of typography would be superior in certain cases; as, for instance, that it would furnish this advantage to those who wished to annul an agreement or recant a recantation, that they could *break their words* with much more ease than if they had been put in print, and would not have the trouble of apologizing for apologies or explaining explanations. But it must be obvious that this would not so well subserve the interests of truth. It is also manifest that this mode could never permanently preserve such works and speeches as were worthy of being transmitted to posterity, inasmuch as, like the beautiful palace of ice built upon the river Neva, they would dissolve with the return of spring and become an undistinguishable mass of "melting discourses."

I might go on to speak of many other advantages which we derive from the art of printing; but lest I should be prolix, I will at this time only notice some in which, by reason of late improvements, we greatly surpass even our immediate ancestors. During the last century it was exceedingly difficult for authors to procure a subsistence. In the days of Otway, Savage, Goldsmith, Fielding and Johnson, they were obliged to toil incessantly to procure a scanty pittance, and were often involved in the greatest embarrassment and distress. But since the establishment of *periodical* publications, sustained by subscription, their revenues have lost their uncertain character, and authorship has become in many cases a luerative occupation. Almost all the finest modern writers, indeed, are engaged in the support of periodicals at immense salaries, and the best and most popular works are issued in this form. This, then, I regard as a great improvement in the art. And every modern author ought to feel duly sensible of the superior advantage which he enjoys in being thus enabled, in a certain sense, to sup upon the same light aerial diet as his own Fame;

> "Who, like a thin chameleon, boards
> Herself on air, and eats her words."

Candor, however, obliges me to confess that although this be an advantage to authors, it is sometimes a disadvantage to the community. When some great cause is to be sustained, such as that of political freedom or social rights, or more especially that of religion, many writers will lay hold of the opportunity to obtain a good subscription to a periodical which is ostensibly devoted to the good of the cause, but which is really consecrated to the good of the editor. It is, indeed,

matter of common experience that whenever any cause becomes prosperous, an abundance of periodicals start up, from the penny newspaper to the monthly magazine or quarterly review, the real object of which is manifestly to promote private ends and batten upon the credulity of mankind. These soon become a burden to the cause rather than an advantage to it; yet they often contrive to keep up appearances, and by dint of begging advertisements almost every month, and a variety of other agencies, manage to perpetuate their existence. It is, however, far different with those who have dared to hazard their character and fortunes in a cause when it was weak and unpopular, and without an advocate. These will continue to deserve support and patronage as they will continue to sustain the interests to which they have given such good evidence of their entire devotion. It is, notwithstanding, by no means the case that *all* who commence periodicals when a cause is prosperous, are influenced by private and personal considerations. Many of them are doubtless as pure, honorable, disinterested, and as truly given up to the promotion of the cause they plead, as any who have ever engaged in it. But what I wish to remark upon it is this, that to those who are so disposed, the Press furnishes the means of selfish aggrandizement; and this, because, according to our modern improved style, the editor has possession of it himself; and having the entire management in his hands, has superior advantages over the writers of the past century, who were completely under the control of the printer and the bookseller, over whom our modern writers now exercise in turn an undisputed jurisdiction.

I beg leave to remark here, lest these desultory reflections should be without an object or an application, or appear wholly alien to the purposes of your Millennial Harbinger, that the time may come when, even among ourselves, the control and influence of the Press will imperiously require the attention of the brotherhood, and that it is therefore important to consider the subject in due time. That the march of truth can be wholly suspended, or the primitive gospel be entirely corrupted by any agency, I have no fear. Like the unshorn Sampson it can always burst its bonds. Like the pure fountain which bursts from the rock, and which, as it wends its way to the ocean, does not only purify and gladden the region through which it flows, but has the power of separating from its own waters and depositing in sediment whatever feculence may have commingled with them, the streamlet of truth has the power not only of diffusing health and life through all its borders, but of purifying itself as it proceeds, and freeing itself from the contamination of error. But that, as the Press can aid the progress of truth, it may to the same extent impede it, there can be no question

and hence it is that every one who loves the cause in which we are engaged must feel interested to see that it be not permitted to exert an influence so pernicious. And may I add, lest my own intentions be misunderstood, that I have felt it a duty, which I have from time to time endeavored to discharge, to warn the brethren in reference to this matter; that my remarks are designed to have a general bearing; and that I make no special or personal application to any individual. This I leave to every one to do for themselves, since for others I presume not either to judge or to reform. And this I say, because a certain editor has, as it seems to me from the uncertain remarks and ambiguous references he has made, taken to himself,

> "Like him that took the Doctor's bill.
> And swallow'd it instead of th' pill,"

a hypothetical case which in my last communication I introduced to illustrate the subject. I beg leave to assure him that I made no such application, and that while I am myself responsible for all that I have said, I will not allow any injurious language or unjust accusations to deter me from rebuking any errors of a public character, by which the cause of truth and the peace of the Christian community are affected.

Is the reformation Press beyond the reach of censure? Does it require no monitor? Must the injury which it inflicts upon the cause of truth be silently sanctioned? Have the brotherhood no protection against its abuses? Is it subject to no tribunal? If so, then may we proceed with our subject by adding to the advantages which modern editors enjoy, by having control of the Press, that they may, "*sans peur et sans reproche*," in one sense at least, employ it for the promotion of their own glory, under the pretence of serving the cause of religion. This is certainly a great advantage. James says, "Be not many teachers, knowing that we shall receive a severer sentence." But he spoke only of the tongue! Printing was as yet unknown! The privileges it confers were as yet undiscovered! They were then accountable only for the use of the tongue, and were admonished not too eagerly to desire the office of teacher on account of its high responsibilities. Indeed none but the wicked are represented as saying, "Our lips are our own; who is Lord over us?" But a modern editor may say with impeccability and impunity, when charged with error or with an appropriation of his press to personal interests or primate animosity, "My press is my own." This also, I think, although an advantage to the editor, is a disadvantage to the community, and especially to the subscribers with whom he has entered into covenant. It seems to me that they also might say, (it is so easy to talk,) 'the paper is ours, inasmuch as we pay for it, and sustain it; and we have a right to require

that it be conducted agreeably to the principles laid down in its commencement, so that your *prospectus* shall exactly correspond with our *retrospectus*.'

Another advantage afforded by our modern improved art of printing and book-making, and I shall conclude with this for the present, is, that it affords editors the opportunity, by slyly substituting the book for the person, to say many things to which they could not so well give utterance in any other way. This is your editorial prosopopeia, in which books are made to walk and talk, to make bargains and break them; to accuse and excuse; to be insulted and abused, to contend and defend, just like any "Christian." This, in short, is the old "battle of the books" revived again. And it would certainly be a great advantage if an author could make his words—

> "Which naught external can expose,
> To gross material bangs and blows,"

fight his battles for him. I doubt, however, whether the author does not feel what is said of his book as much as if it was said of himself; and I cannot but conjecture that he who adopts this style does so only because it is somewhat less odious in the view of the community, and that by appearing to have a book between him and his opponent, his accusations and insinuations will be more readily tolerated.

Upon the whole, I should be happy if all these matters could be so regulated that the advantages and disadvantages of our modern art of printing would be equitably distributed. Or, if every thing above spoken of be really and truly advantageous and incapable of improvement, I should like mightily to see some one, either clergyman or layman, construct thereupon a solid and convincing argument to prove that we have at last come to the end. In which conclusion I remain as ever yours, D. A.

FAMILY CULTURE.

CONVERSATIONS AT THE CARLTON HOUSE.

No. X.

ON COVENANTS.

After reading the covenant with Noah and all flesh, Olympas made the subject of Covenants the burthen of the conversation for the day.

Olympas. Can any of you give me a scriptural name for this *transaction* between God and Noah after his devotion at the altar?

William. It is called a *covenant*.

Olympas. Has any of you met this word before?

William. It has not occurred before this time in the writings of Moses. It is, indeed, often used after this date.

Olympas. But when I ask for a *name* for this transaction with Noah, I ask for more than the title found in Genesis ix. Has it no other name than a *covenant?*

Reuben. I think you told us that the Lord alluded to this transaction by Jeremiah when he said, "If you can break my covenant of the day and my covenant of the night, and that there should not be day and night in their season."

Olympas. Yes; in Jeremiah xxxiii. 20, 25, the Lord speaks of day and night as *covenanted* matters, never to be changed; and we know of no other instance in which they are solemnly guarantied, except this one. We therefore regard this Noahic Covenant as a "*Covenant of Day and Night,*" guarantying their continuance while the earth endureth. What is a covenant, Reuben?

Reuben. A covenant, according to Walker, is "a contract, a stipulation, a compact."

Olympas. Or it may be defined, "an agreement between two parties on certain terms." The parties may be called *covenanter* and *covenantee.* The former stipulates, the latter restipulates or agrees. *Covenanter,* since the civil wars of England and Scotland, has a sort of political and appropriated meaning, indicating one who takes a covenant; but in common signification it indicates one who proposes and stipulates a covenant; while the *covenantee* denotes the party who accedes to it. Still you must note here that a divine covenant is not called *sunthekee,* but *diathekee.* In a *sunthekee* the parties meet as equals, but in a *diathekee* the covenanter may be a father or a king, and the covenantee may be a son or a subject. A full proof of this you have in our lesson. God is here the covenanter, and Noah and all the fowls of the air, and all the beasts of the field are covenantees. Read the text, James.

James. "And I, behold, I establish my covenant with you, and with your seed after you; and with every living creature that is with you, of the fowl, of the cattle, and of every beast of the earth with you, from all that go out of the ark, to every beast of the earth. And I will establish my covenant with you; neither shall all flesh be cut off any more by the waters of a flood; neither shall there any more be a flood to destroy the earth. And God said, This is the token of the covenant which I make between me and you, and every living creature that is with you, for perpetual generations: I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth. And it shall come to pass, when I bring a cloud over the earth, that the bow

shall be seen in the cloud: and I will remember my covenant, which is between me and you, and every living creature of all flesh; and the waters shall no more become a flood to destroy all flesh. And the bow shall be in the cloud; and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth. And God said unto Noah, This is the token of the covenant which I have established between me and all flesh that is upon the earth."

Olympas. Thus you see "all flesh, fowl, cattle, every living thing upon the earth," are included as one party to this everlasting covenant of temporalities. It was to be commensurate with time, with the earth, and the present course of nature, and is a guarantee or pledge to animated nature that such a desolation as that just ended should never again occur. As a matter for future reference I would now state that it is not incompatible with the nature of a *diathekee* or scriptural covenant, that the covenantees be both passive and inconscious; nor is it incompatible that they be not only conscious, but active and leading in the transaction. God often propounds every item, and by his authority and supreme benevolence makes it the duty of man simply to acquiesce. What, Eliza, are the items of this covenant?

Eliza. They are but two:—1st. That all flesh shall never again be cut off by the waters of another flood; and, 2d. That the earth itself shall never again be destroyed by a universal deluge.

Olympas. And what about Day and Night, Eliza?

Eliza. This is only implied here; for it was promised just at the altar.

Olympas. Read the passage, Susan.

Susan. "And the Lord smelled a sweet savor; and the Lord said in his heart, I will not again curse the ground any more for man's sake; for the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth: neither will I smite any more every living thing as I have done. While the earth remaineth, seed-time and harvest, cold and heat, summer and winter, and day and night shall not cease."

Thomas. I never could understand why the Lord assigned the wickedness of man as a reason why he would not again destroy the race.

Olympas. This is a mistranslation. It ought not to read, "*For* the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth." It ought to read according to the original, "*Though* the imagination of man's heart should be evil from his youth." *Ki* in Hebrew signifies *though*, *although*, as well as *for* and *on account of*. If man should be ever so wicked, I will not again drown the earth. He has promised to burn it. The present earth is reserved for *fire*, not *water*.

Olympas. And what, Thomas, concerning the *token* of this covenant? Was there no *rainbow* before the flood?

Thomas. It is a physical effect; and I think it probable that there were as many rainbows as there were the causes which now produce them. But did you not teach us that the consecrating of a stone into a monument, or the ordaining of any thing in nature for a sign, token, or pledge, was just the same as originating that thing altogether, because it has received a new meaning.

Olympas. Substantially you are right. It is not important to decide the question whether this was the first rainbow; it is certain that it then became a new sign and received a meaning which it had not before. It is now a speaking token to all who believe the Bible—a solemn pledge that we shall have the present course of things physical till the day of fire and everlasting destruction.

Thomas. May not covenants be regarded simply as promises and pledges from the Lord, and as the ground-work and reason of all human expectation.

Olympas. They are indeed the rule and measure of all human hope and expectation. God has promised and covenanted all that he ever will do for us, and these covenants make requisition of our duty and obligations to him, based upon his gifts and covenants. We must be in the covenant, however, before any of its provisions are ours, or before we can justly claim any thing from it. In what covenants are we in consequence of our birth, Eliza?

Eliza. We are born within the covenant with Adam, and within the covenant with Noah, and the covenant with Abraham.

Olympas Then we must have been represented by three great men. In what respects did Adam, Noah, and Abraham represent us, Reuben?

Reuben. Adam and Noah were the fathers of all mankind, and whatever they had guarantied to them as such belongs to their children, their heirs, and successors forever. But I do not understand how Abraham is our father according to covenant as Adam and Noah were. They were the heads and fathers of all mankind. Abraham is only the father of nations.

Olympas. Abraham is indeed the natural and covenanted father of only a part of mankind; but Adam and Noah of all. They are all, however, covenantees. There was a covenant with Adam, else we could not die for his sin. There was a covenant with Noah, as you have now read, under which we enjoy all temporal blessings; and in virtue of the covenant with Abraham his descendants by Isaac and Jacob became the inheritors of a certain country, a rich and beautiful land. They also inherited the right to the flesh of the Messiah, and

various other worldly blessings, in none of which are we interested as partakers with them. Eliza, then, is mistaken when she says that we are born in covenant with Abraham. How did you, Eliza, imbibe that idea.

Eliza. On the last fast day at Mr. Paido Raino's chapel I heard him say that all his congregation were in covenant with Abraham as much as with Adam; for that Abraham was a natural and a spiritual father, the natural father of all the Jews, Edomites, Ishmaelites, and other nations, and the spiritual father of believers of all nations.

Olympas. Well, my daughter, when you hear any one speak on the Bible, you must learn to try what they say by what is written in the book, and not to try the book of God by what they say. This Mr. *Paido Raino* is the pleader for a practice which falls to the ground, unless he could sustain that point. And yet the very ideas which you have quoted from him prove him to be in error. He said that the Ishmaelites, Idumeans, and Jews were the natural seed of Abraham.—This is true, and once his circumcised seed too; but he added that Abraham was the father in covenant of all his congregation, because he is the father of all them that believe of all nations; and yet he dare not say that all his congregation are believers in the Messiah, the promised seed and heir of all Abraham's covenanted spiritual blessings. It is indeed true that Abraham is the natural father of the Jews, Edomites, Ishmaelites, &c., and he is the covenanted father of all the Jews, as well as their literal and true progenitor; and it is true that he is the spiritual and covenanted father of all believers of all nations, *but not of the fleshly seed of true believers.* This last point is the corner stone of Mr. Paino Raino's chapel, church, and congregation. The fleshly seed of true believers are not the *natural* nor *spiritual* seed of Abraham, and therefore are neither in the temporal nor spiritual covenant with Abraham. Paul teaches that if Gentiles are *in Christ*, then, and only then, are they Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise—"They who are of faith are blessed with believing Abraham." But it no where says in the whole Bible, Old Testament or New, that the natural posterity of believers are the children of Abraham in any sense whatever; and therefore they are not in covenant with Abraham. But of this we may speak more fully when we come to the Abrahamic covenants. What, Thomas, think you of the entails upon our race in virtue of the Adamic and Noahic covenants?

Thomas. By the former mortality is ours, and by the latter a freedom from another destruction of the species, the earth and its inhabitants, by water, is secured to us.

Olympas. True, we inherit death and the curse, as well as life and

all that is desirable in it, from Adam. We are the sons of a degenerate and degraded father, and participate with him in all the consequences of his violation of covenant, whether it be in constitution, person, or estate: for when a covenant is broken by one party it is not disannulled. The other party demands the fulfilment of its conditions or the penalty of a failure from all the covenantees to the expiration of the last item in its provisions. Observe, therefore, that all the gifts and callings of God are on his part without repentance or change, and that we are all living, while in Adam the first, under the consequences of a broken covenant. How many covenants, William, can you find in the Old and New Testaments of divine authority?

William. There are six in the Old Testament: The Adamic, the Noahic, the Abrahamic, the Sinaitic, the Aaronic, or sacerdotal, and the Monarchic with David and his line.

Olympas. Do you concur, Reuben, with that view of the matter?

Reuben. I think there are a plurality of covenants with Abraham—one concerning his natural offspring and their inheritance, and another concerning Christ.

Olympas. Can you give us the names of these covenants?

Reuben. Paul speaks of the "*covenant concerning Christ,*" made four hundred and thirty years before the giving of the law. Gal. iii. 17. And Stephen calls the covenant found in Gen. xvii. "*the covenant of circumcision.*" This was some twenty-four or twenty five years after the former.

Olympas. Whom did these two covenants respect?

Thomas. That concerning Christ respects the whole world; that respecting circumcision respected the seed of Abraham only, or his natural offspring.

Olympas. What is the date of the covenant of circumcision, William?

William. It was made in the hundredth year of Abraham, four hundred and five years before giving the law.

Olympas. And what the date of "the covenant concerning Christ?"

William. It was made in the year of Abraham 75, or four hundred and thirty years before the giving of the law; and respected spiritual blessings only through Christ.

Olympas. There are, then, two covenants with Abraham—one concerning flesh; another concerning spirit—his natural offspring and Christ; the one represented by Hagar and Ishmael—the other by Sarah and Isaac. Gal. iv. So that we have *two* at least with Abraham. Indeed, some reckon three—one concerning the Messiah, Gen. xii; one concerning Canaan, Gen. xv.; one concerning his fleshly seed,

Gen. xvii, But the two last being engrossed, Gen. xvii., make but one covenant concerning his fleshly seed, and that leaves the other for his spiritual or believing children wherever they may be found. We may then count a covenant with Adam, one with Noah, two with Abraham, one with the whole nation at Sinai, one with Aaron, and one with David, in all seven. The great covenantees are Adam and his heirs, Noah and his heirs, Abraham and his heirs natural, Abraham and his heirs spiritual, the Jews and their heirs, Aaron and his heirs, David and his heirs. Now, to understand these seven covenants, is to understand the Old Testament well, and that is the best preparation for the New. But as I wish frequently to touch upon these covenants till you all comprehend their meaning, I will dismiss them for the present with one observation, viz.—You are all interested directly in the first two—*passively*, indeed, as were all the fowls of heaven and the cattle in the Noahic covenant, of which we now treat. You were born under the dominion of two; but none of you by virtue of mere natural birth can inherit the blessings of the covenant concerning Christ. You must become the children of the Christian covenant by faith in the Messiah. Then, indeed, if you be Christ's, you are Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise. A. C.

THE PROGRESS OF REFORMATION AMONG THE BAPTISTS.

Since light has been diffused amongst the Baptists on the points of discussion, and they begin to understand our views, despite of all the misrepresentations which have been repeated from the pulpit and the press, they now very generally excuse their opposition to us by saying we are becoming more orthodox, we are changing, &c. That they are changing in many respects is matter of universal notoriety; and that there is a most remarkable approximation to our views on the most cardinal points of debate, is known to all who know what is passing in that community and what we have written. Through the kindness of a South Carolina friend I have been permitted to see the following remarks in a late Biblical Recorder. Now as no one will suspect Elder Meredith of unreasonable partiality to us personally, his late developments must be regarded as a singular triumph of truth and light over deep-rooted prejudice and long-cherished error. The very root and origin of my heresy, in Baptist esteem, is found in the 8th number of the first volume of the Christian Baptist, and is here boldly advocated by the Editor of the Biblical Recorder in self-defence

against the imputation of heresy. Any one well read in the pending controversy needs no interpreter to point out to him the numerous recognitions of the cardinal point in the question of the *witness of the Spirit* to our sonship as children of God, found in the following reply to Mr. Bradford, from the pen of Elder Meredith.

We shall give the whole article to our readers that they may judge for themselves. This is a greater point, when all its bearings are comprehended, than any other discussed during the present century. It strikes deep into the heart of popular errors, and transfuses itself over the whole surface of the dogmatic theology of the present day. I am glad to see one of Mr. Meredith's abilities fairly committed to the public on the nature of that evidence which the Spirit of God vouchsafes to all the children of God. He is now as fully heterodox as ourselves on this point: for we never went farther than he has now gone, if he and we are to be understood by what we have published to the world. A. C.

SILVERTON, S. C., June 29, 1840.

BROTHER MEREDITH:

Dear Sir—I send you enclosed five dollars on my subscription for the Recorder for this year, and in advance as far as it will go into the next.

You see I do not intend to act as many have done—withdraw my support from the paper because my views differ from those advanced by its Editor; and that he has the independence to advance and defend them. On the contrary, I admire this trait of his character, and hope and believe he will never swerve from an independent course.

When you commenced on the subject of conversion I was pleased. I thought our brethren needed some light on this subject, as their views were, I believed, generally incorrect, having received them from the ———.

I expected you would meet with a host of opposition, but that it would result in good—that it would cause the brethren to investigate the subject, and thereby get their erroneous impressions removed. I did not dream that any would discontinue their subscription. I said I was pleased when you commenced. I was also pleased in the progress with the exception of your views on two points—they are, on the witness of the Spirit, and on the forgiveness of sin. If I understand you, you deny there being such a thing as the witness of the Spirit. In doing so, my brother, I think you deny what the scriptures directly assert, Rom. viii. 16. If you had merely denied that extraordinary revelation of the Spirit which some enthusiasts pretend to, I should have agreed with you; and this is what you appear to be combatting; but at the same time you deny (if I understand you rightly) the existence of any influence or operation of the Spirit, by which a Christian is assured that he is a child of God, by a testimony within him. I would ask you, my brother, what is it that makes him *feel* that he is a child, and that God is his father, if it is not the Spirit's influence? What is it fills his soul with such sweet peace and delight?

He may not have heard whether there be any Holy Ghost; but will place his hand on his heart and say he feels something there he never felt before—that he feels that God is his father and he is his child—begotten again unto a lively hope, &c. The 8th chapter of Romans, 16th verse, seemed to stand in your way considerably, and you got away over the other side of it, I cannot tell how. My brother, I think if you will look carefully at it again, you will be compelled to admit there is some such operation as the witness of the Spirit.

Your views on the forgiveness of sins are entirely new to me. You say (if I understand you) one's sins are forgiven when he believes, and yet they are not forgiven until he repents; and yet again, they are not forgiven until he is baptized. These are not your words, but what I understand you to mean. It may be possible I misunderstand you. I would not wilfully misrepresent you. If I am right, however, it perplexes my mind how these things can be. I presume the thief on the cross was forgiven, and that he received forgiveness, and all the consequences thereof, although he was not baptized. Some of our good brethren think your view of conversion savors of Campbellism. I tell them it does not, as a general view, savor of Campbellism at all—that there is only one point in which you agree with Campbell, and that is baptismal remission, and that we should not judge our brother too hastily; that I am willing to wait until you explain yourself more clearly, or bring it within the grasp of my apprehension, before I condemn or adopt your views on this point. I have endeavored to get some of those who have discontinued to renew their subscriptions; but have not been able to succeed as yet. I hope, after a while, they will renew. I feel interested for the prosperity of the Recorder, and may wisdom and great grace be bestowed upon you.

Yours in Christian bonds,

R. BRADFORD.

REMARKS.

We are so much pleased with the spirit of the foregoing communication, that we are induced to give it an insertion, although not in accordance with the wishes of the writer. We trust our correspondent will excuse the liberty we take, however, especially when he reflects that there are probably sundry others who would be pleased to see the same explanations which he requests for himself. Besides, he may rest assured that there is nothing in either the style or matter of his letter, to which the most querulous can justly take exception.

Respecting the matter of *discontinuance* we would remark in passing, that our brother labors under some mistake. We have not had *many* discontinuances from any cause. In some *few* places, where we suppose the cry of *heresy* has had its effect, there have been perhaps more than the usual number, and we have been informed that these have been in part occasioned by our articles on "conversion," and "calling up mourners." In towns, however, and in all country places where intelligence is known to abound among the people, and where there has not been a sinister influence in operation, we have probably had fewer discontinuances than in any former year. Considering the peculiar pressure of the times, the fact that we have not had an agent in the field for more than a year, and the additional fact that we have

made no sort of exertion ourselves to increase the number of our subscribers, the state of our subscription list more than equals our most sanguine anticipations.

Our brother's statement with respect to those of his own vicinity is no doubt correct. And while we return him our thanks for his kindly interference in our behalf, we would just say, that we trust he will make no further application to any one who is known to have discontinued for the reason aforesaid. We have always found such subscribers "more plague than profit." And as there is no probability that such persons, with their present views, will derive much advantage from ours or any other paper, we can have no sort of motive for desiring to have their names again on our lists.

That our articles on "conversion," on "calling up," &c. have done good, we cannot entertain a doubt. If they have done no more than this, they have at least led to inquiry and investigation; and all inquiry and investigation, on important topics, necessarily tend to useful results. The excitement and opposition which have been produced in certain places by the aforesaid articles, only show that attention has been awakened, and that the process of examination has commenced. The *good fruits* will be seen "many days hence."

It will be observed that our correspondent, although a Baptist, and we presume a brother of unsuspected orthodoxy, takes exception to but *two points* in our late essays: these are those which treat of the "witness of the Spirit," and of the "forgiveness of sins."

Respecting the former, our correspondent fully concurs with us in denying "that extraordinary revelation of the Spirit, which some enthusiasts pretend to," and admits that this is what we "appear to have been combatting." The only thing to which he excepts, under this head, is, as he understands us, our having "denied the existence of any influence or operation of the Spirit, by which a Christian is assured that he is a child of God, by a testimony within him."

Now we think if our good brother will refer to our article again, he will find that he has greatly misunderstood us. He will find that we admit the direct influence and operation of the Spirit in regenerating the sinner. He will find that we admit the influence and operation of the Spirit in the production of faith, repentance, love, and all the other fruits of the Spirit. He will also find that these fruits of the Spirit constitute, in our view, that *inward evidence* by which the Christian is assured that he is a child of God, and which, when attended by corresponding outward evidence, "makes him feel that he is a child, and that God is his father." Our language was as follows: "That the Spirit does bear testimony in some way to the fact of the disciples' adoption and consequent acceptance, is here [Rom. viii. 16.] clearly attested. The question to be asked is, Is this done directly, or indirectly? If it is done directly, then every true convert has a special revelation—the reality of his conversion is put beyond a possible doubt." &c &c. "But if it be allowed that the testimony borne by the Spirit is borne indirectly, then the question is setiled in favor of those who deny. In that case the meaning of the Apostle must be, that the Spirit testifies, not by making a revelation, but simply by producing those good fruits, in the heart, and the life, on which we have so much insisted," &c. &c. This is what we understand by the "inward witness or testimony of the Spirit."

Our brother asks, "What makes the Christian feel that he is a child," &c. We would ask, What *can* make him feel this? If the Christian *feel* that he is a child of God *intelligibly*, it seems to us it must be because he *believes* himself to be such. And if he believe himself to be a child *intelligibly*, it must be because he has evidence of some kind that such is the fact. That the mere feeling that one is a Christian, can constitute evidence of personal acceptance; or that such feeling can rationally exist except so far as it results from a corresponding belief, we are sure that our brother B. is as far from admitting as we are. In fact, we presume the word *feel*, in the present case, has been introduced as a substitute for the word *believe*. To *feel* that we are Christians is neither more nor less than to entertain a joyful belief or consciousness that such is the fact.

The question may then fairly take this shape, What can make a man believe himself to be a Christian? Beyond a doubt, if his belief be a rational one, it must be the result of evidence. But evidence of what sort? Unquestionably it must be either direct or indirect. That is, if the Spirit testify, he must do it either directly or indirectly. But the direct testimony of the Spirit to any fact, would be a special revelation. But our brother B. rejects the doctrine of a special revelation. It must follow then, of course, that if the Spirit testify to the sinner's conversion, or make him believe or feel that he is a child of God, it must be done indirectly, through the production of faith, love, sorrow for sin, and sundry other affections and fruits of divine influence.

The truth is, our correspondent's views, though somewhat differently expressed, are just about the same as our own. He goes for founding the Christian's confidence in something more solid and durable and safe than dreams, or visions, or revelations, or paroxysms of grief or joy. He goes for cutting off all those grounds of false and delusive peace, which may endure for a season, but in the end will bring ruin and despair. He goes for reducing the ground of hope to something that is intelligible, durable, and of a certain and unequivocal nature. And this is the precise point at which we have been driving, and nothing more. We are agreed, too, that the only evidence allowable in the case, is to be attributed to the operation and influence of the Holy Spirit. Now, whether we call this influence direct or indirect, or whether we denominate the effect *feeling*, or *belief*, or *consciousness*, or *hope*, can be by no means material. If we are agreed about the *thing*, it is not important that we should contend about words.

We think, however, that our brother B. will agree with us, that the word *feel* is not the most happy that could have been used, simply because of its liability to be misunderstood. So long as we speak of *feeling* that we are children of God, the less informed will be apt to take feeling for evidence, and because they feel that they are the children of God, therefore believe that they are such. This we fear has been, and is still, the case with thousands. And this, indeed, is the great evil against which we have been contending. Let this error be provided against—let it be distinctly understood that feeling can never be received in place of evidence, and that no one can safely conclude himself to be a child of God until after having had rational, intelligible, and convincing evidence that such is the fact, and it amounts to but little, in our estimation, whether we call this direct or indirect

testimony, or whether we ascribe it to the fruits or to the influence of the Spirit.

Our brother will please bear in mind that we do not deny that there is any such operation as the witnessing of the Spirit in any sense. What we deny is the witness of the Spirit as commonly understood—namely, an inward conviction which supersedes all other evidence, which creates an assurance amounting to demonstration; and which, in the nature of the case, can be nothing short of a special and direct revelation. This, if we understand our correspondent, is denied by himself, no less than by us.

In our next we shall furnish a few explanatory remarks in relation to our correspondent's inquiries on the subject of "forgiveness." We had prepared them for insertion this week, in connexion with the foregoing, but find their admission will render the article too long. In the mean time our correspondent will please accept of our thanks for his candid, manly, and brotherly expression of objections to our views. If we know any thing of the spirit of the gospel, or of the rules of Christian courtesy, that is the style and temper in which all our discussions should be conducted. Such communications we shall always welcome; and such correspondents it will afford us pleasure to satisfy to the utmost extent of our power.——*Bib. Recorder.*

SUPREMACY OF CHRIST.

Jacksonville, Illinois, June 12, 1840.

MR. A. CAMPBELL:

WERE the Queen of England to send A. B. to govern her dominions in N. America, clothed with unlimited power, not only to govern the people, but invested with the right to the soil, the lives and property of the citizens, and also with this command from the mouth of the Queen to her subjects, resident in North America—"This is my Viceroy, hear him in all things:"—I ask, Would it not be rebelling against the crown and dignity of England (instead of asking A. B. for favors) still to petition the Queen to grant favors, even by announcing in the name of A. B.? Would not her answer in justice be, "Apply to A. B.; he is clothed with all my authority, and it will be a violation of usage, not to say law, for me to hear your request: go to A. B., and remember, in treating him with contempt, you rebel against me!"

In short, is not Christ the proper character to be addressed in all our petitions to a throne of grace? He has all things in his possession, both in heaven and on earth—he is not himself subject, even to his Father. He is the only lawgiver, and of course all sins are immediately against him, as sin is the transgression of the law.

To him is given all judgment: see Matth. xi. 27; xvi. 27; xxviii. 17: Luke xxiv. 52: John v. 22; x. 28; xiv. 14; xvi. 24: Acts v. 31; vii. 59; ix. 14 and 21: 1 Cor. i. 2; xv. 28: 1 John v. 15.

Please be so good as to answer my queries as soon as practicable.

Yours, with respect,

A. W. SWEET.

REMARKS ON THE ABOVE.

The powers with which you have invested A. B., are not the powers of a Viceroy. They are those of a supreme king, having the soil of the country and the lives and property of its inhabitants at his disposal. In such a case, to petition any other sovereign, would be unlawful and absurd.

But it is dangerous to reason too closely from earthly analogies to heavenly things, especially when these analogies are not drawn by the unerring wisdom of God. I believe and teach, not from my own apprehension and analogies and resemblances, but from Apostolic teaching and example, that it is lawful to address the Lord and call upon his name, as the head of all principality and power. Still he is also the *mediator* between God and man—and through him we come to God the Father, and address him through the *intercession* of his Son. He is "*the way*" to the Father; "*a way new and living*, consecrated for us"—and through him, as did Paul, so may we "bow our knees to the God and Father of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." "We call on the Father, who, without respect of persons, judgeth," &c.

How great the honor we enjoy of addressing, not the Son and Mediator only, but God himself, through him, as our Father in heaven, as our God and portion forever! Thus worshipped the Apostles. "Now may God himself, and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way to you!" So let us pray, and when God has left us free, let us not shackle ourselves or one another! We expect on this subject to speak more fully in another place. A. C.

From the Baptist Advocate.

"THE PLYMOUTH BRETHREN."

Leamington Spa, (Eng.) December 30, 1839.

You will doubtless have heard of the rise of this new, growing, and, in many points of view, interesting sect. As they have recently held their annual conference in this place, and are destined, it is believed, to occupy, at some future period, an important and conspicuous place in the ranks of the "sacramental host," a brief sketch of their history and religious principles may not prove unacceptable to your readers, and certainly not inappropriate to the character of your journal.

The term employed to designate this body of Christians would naturally convey the impression that they were either identical, or held many of the peculiar tenets in harmony with the "United Brethren," or Moravians. But this is not so. Maintaining, as they do, all the essential truths of the gospel in unison with the great body of evangelical Christians, they yet allow themselves to be claimed by no religious party, and reject every specific appellation that would represent them as a distinct sect—even the one placed at the head of this article,

by which they are generally known. When the returns ordered by Parliament were made of the various religious bodies, they were asked by what name they would be designated. On replying that it was quite optional with the officer to use what term he pleased, he put them down "Catholic, not Roman." The term "Plymouth Brethren," however, as I have remarked, is that which distinguishes them from other religious bodies, and which appears to have adhered to them from the circumstance that the town whose name they bear was the birthplace of the sect. Dr. Bennet, however, in his "History of Dissenters," says that it is thought they existed in Geneva in 1824, and in Ireland at a contemporaneous period.

With regard to the individuals who compose the body, they are mainly seceders from the English Establishment, greatly swelling the number of those who have recently separated from a state religion. Indeed, their chief speakers are graduates from the Universities, and who have officiated as clergymen for years at important posts. As far as education, rank, and spirituality confer distinction, they are, as a body of Christians, second to none in the realm. It is said that some of them are editing valuable concordances to the Hebrew and Greek scriptures.

It is difficult to learn with perfect minuteness and accuracy, what are their distinctive religious principles. Rejecting all creeds and human formula, and taking the Bible as their only text-book, and yet among themselves differing in their interpretations of many of its parts, it is almost impossible to place one's finger upon the precise ligament that unites the whole body. They, however, agree in rejecting all orders of ministry—human ordination—sectional churches—monthly and close communion—and even refuse to ascend a pulpit, considering it an *elevatum* in the church of Christ, destructive of its primitive simplicity and oneness. They renounce all worldly honor and distinction—observe, in their dress and domestic economy, the strictest simplicity—many of them advocating (and even carrying out their principles) a community of goods and interests. Their views of the Holy Spirit are rather peculiar. They attach great importance to the *personal presence* of the spirit of the church, promised by the Redeemer, bestowed at his ascension, and which still remains, and ever will remain. They think it wrong, therefore, to ask for the *gift* of the Spirit—the Spirit having already been given as an abiding substitute for Christ; and the phrases "the outpouring of the Spirit," "the descent of the Spirit," &c. are never uttered by them, either in exhortation or prayer. They hold to the views of believers' baptism, weekly communion, the second coming of Christ, and his personal reign upon a renovated earth. Their views of divine truth are decidedly Calvinistic—they yet are found standing up in the streets and highways preaching Christ, and warning every man. Christian missions and kindred institutions find among them warm advocates and liberal supporters. That attribute of character, however, which forms their great distinction, is, their deep-toned spirituality of mind. Religion with them is not a mere sentiment, but a *living principle*. They have Christ in their hearts, and much of him in their spirit and walk. Their crucifixion to the world is a striking and beautiful feature in their piety. Being the *risen* members of a risen head, they believe that, as such,

they have nothing to do with the honors, distinctions, glory, and wealth of the world. They renounce and denounce it all; and, consistent with their principles, many of them have laid aside their titles, equipages, fortunes, and places of honor and trust, counting all worldly things but loss, seeking but to know Christ and "the power of his resurrection." Lady Powerscourt, an Irish peeress, presents one among many illustrations of the practical bearing of their religious principles. W.

The above described religious party is only an effect of a mighty influence now at work in all enlightened countries. As might be expected, they are distinguished by several errors and considerable enthusiasm; but their views are a great improvement upon the corruptions of the Church Establishment.—*D. S. Burnet.*

RESPONSIBILITY OF MAN FOR HIS BELIEF.

The second great mental operation, in which is felt the value of a regulated mind, is the formation of opinions. Here various errors are committed, but all are of serious moment. There is a listless vacuity of mind, which prevents it from being directed with attention or interest to the formation of defied opinions, even on subjects of supreme importance. There is a servility of mind which leaves it the slave of mere authority, without forming opinions for itself by personal inquiry. —And there is a rude and reckless affectation of mental independence, or liberty of thinking, which leads a man to despise authority, to aim at striking out for himself a system distinguished from the received opinions of those around him—led, it may be, by a love of singularity or the vanity of appearing wiser than his neighbors; or, perhaps, impelled by the condition of his moral feelings, to argue himself into the disbelief of what he wishes not to be true.

From all such distortions of the understanding regulated mental discipline tends to preserve. It induces us to approach every subject with a sincere and humble desire for truth—to give its due influence to authority without being blindly led by it—to give its due weight to every evidence without partial views or imperfect examination—and direct the whole powers, not to favor, establish, or overturn particular opinions, but honestly and anxiously to discover what is true. This is a subject of intense and solemn interest. A slight attention to the philosophy of it, will enable you to perceive the true bearing upon us as responsible beings, and how, on the highest of all subjects, a man may incur moral guilt in the formation of his opinions. Both as intellectual and moral beings, the great object by which we are moved, is truth. Truth derives its power from evidence; and there are laws of evidence which in their nature are as absolute and immutable as the laws of physical relations. But for the operation of them a state of the mind itself is required; and without this, even the best evidence may be deprived of its power to produce conviction. For the result of evidence the mind depends on close and continued attention; and this is a voluntary process which every one may be able to perform. It is on this ground, therefore, that we hold a man to be responsible for his belief—and contend that he may incur deep moral guilt in his disbelie

of truths which he has examined in a frivolous or prejudiced manner—or which, perhaps, he indulges in the miserable affectation of disbelieving, without having examined them at all.

The remarkable fact, indeed, appears to be, that the chief source of unbelief on the greatest of all subjects, is generally to be found in a previous moral corruption of the mind. It arises from no defect of evidence, but from a state of mind on which the highest falls without power. This striking moral process begins by a man renouncing the guidance of sound moral principle, and the restraints of religious truth, both on his conduct and on the discipline of his heart. The great truths which he violates are then repelled as intruders, which disturb his mental tranquility; and from this stage in his downward progress the career is short, and the mental progress simple by which he succeeds in driving the belief of them from his own mind. Such is the wondrous economy of the human heart—and such is the history of many a man who, after a certain course of moral degradation, has sought refuge in infidelity.

[*Address of Abercrombie to the Aberdeen Students.*]

PARAGRAPH BY DR. CHANNING.

We are hoping to form new men and women by literature and science; but all in vain. We shall learn in time that moral and religious culture is the foundation and strength of all true cultivation; that we are deforming human nature by the means relied on for its growth, and that the poor who receive a care which awakens their consciences and moral sentiments, start under happier auspices than the prosperous, who place supreme dependence on the education of the intellect and taste. It is the kind, not the extent of knowledge, by which the advancement of a human being must be measured; and that kind which alone exalts a man, is placed within the reach of all. Moral and religious truth—this is the treasure of the intellect, and all are poor without it. This transcends physical truth as far as heaven is lifted above the earth.

TAMERLANE AND FAUST.

When Tamerlane had finished building his pyramids of seventy thousand human skulls, and was seen standing at the gate of Damascus, glittering with steel, with his battle-axe on his shoulder, till the fierce hosts filed to new victories and carnage, the pale on-looker might have fancied that Nature was in her throes—for havoc and despair had taken possession of the earth, and the sun of manhood seemed setting in seas of blood. Yet it might be on that very gala day of Tamerlane, a little boy was playing Nine-Pins in the streets of Mentz, whose history was more important to them than Tamerlane's! The Tartar Khan, with his shaggy demons of the wilderness, passed away like the whirlwind, to be forgotten forever—and that German artizan has wrought a benefit which is yet immeasurable, expanding itself, and will continue to expand throughout all countries and all times. What are the conquests and expeditions of the whole corporations of Captains from Walter the Pennyless to Napoleon Bonaparte, compared with the moveable types of Johannes Faust!——*Dr. Bell.*

THE EFFECTS OF WAR.

We have not lately met with a more impressive paragraph than the following: We find it in an exchange paper, and we pass it on. It deserves to go the rounds:—

Give me the money that has been spent in war, and I will purchase every foot of land upon the globe. I will clothe every man, woman, and child in an attire that kings and queens would be proud of; I will build a school-house upon every valley over the whole habitable earth; I will supply that school house with a competent teacher; I will build an academy in every town, and endow it; a college in every state, and fill it with able Professors; I will crown every hill with a church consecrated to the promulgation of the gospel of peace; I will support in its pulpit an able teacher of righteousness, so that on every Sabbath morning the chime on one hill should answer to the chime on another, around the earth's broad circumference; and the voice of prayer and the song of praise should ascend like a universal holocaust to heaven.—*Stebbins.*

THE TORNADO AT NATCHEZ.

We have just conversed with an observant and scientific citizen of Natchez, who was an eye-witness of the late desolating tempest; and he has communicated to us some particulars which go towards explaining the *rationale* of tornadoes. This gentleman lives in a house built after the Spanish model, and which is more substantial than the great majority of houses in Natchez. Its chimneys were blown down and its windows driven out, and one of its wings, built more recently, but not so securely as the rest of the edifice, was prostrated. The main body of the building was uninjured, and the family escaped.

The gentleman's gardener had just left his own house, close by, and its windows and doors were by accident left open; it received no injury. The gardener of a friend, living in his immediate neighborhood, hastened to his house when he saw the storm approaching, and succeeded in closing his doors and windows, which he had scarcely done when the house fell and crushed him under the ruins. Dr. Tooley, the neighbor of our informant, and a man of science, with a just conception of the action of the tempest, threw open all the windows and doors of his house, not already open when the storm commenced; and, although the structure of it was frail, it sustained no injury; not even a pane of glass was broken. It was saved by the free outlet given to the air in the room seeking to restore the balance in the atmosphere. Houses that were made as air-tight as the closing of doors and windows could render them, were in the condition of the sealed bottle under the exhausted receiver of an air-pump, the pent up air of which shivers it into a thousand fragments. The destruction of houses was entirely owing to the sudden expansion of the air within, said to have been equal to the explosive force of gunpowder. They were exploded—the roofs shot up into the air, and the bricks in the walls were projected with great violence in all directions around. In many cases the upper rooms, or garrets, which were more confined, alone exploded;

the other apartments escaping in consequence of the exit afforded to the air by doors and windows. Our informant represents it as having been the work of an instant. The wind did not seem to him to blow harder than it did in this city last Saturday evening. It appeared that the common air was suddenly and strangely rarefied—as if its pressure had been at once annihilated—and, in this state, the atmosphere confined in house rushing out into the void, threw down every wall not of remarkable strength, or having large outlets by which it might escape. He walked forth a moment after his own house felt the concussion, and beheld on all sides houses prostrate, and his neighbors crawling forth from under their ruins. He confirms the statement already given, that a marvellously small number of persons perished, considering how many houses full of inhabitants were demolished in a single moment of time.

Those persons who heard the lectures of Dr. Espy, on his late visit to our city, will be struck with the confirmation which the tornado of Natchez gives to his theory of storms. As he maintained was the fact in all such tempests, the buildings in that ill-fated city were thrown down by an *explosion*—the instantaneous expansion of the air within the houses. And the practical lesson to be drawn from the whole is, that the windows of our dwellings should be raised, and the doors thrown open, during a tornado, to allow free egress to the air, in the case of the rarefaction of the atmosphere without.

Louisville Journal.

THOUGHTS ON EVIDENCE—*No. IX.*

It has been supposed that the power of believing human testimony is a distinct and peculiar faculty of the mind, differing from the powers through which we derive convictions from the evidence of sense or consciousness. The reader will have perceived that we have by no means adopted this hypothesis, but that we have throughout regarded evidence of every kind as addressed alike to that common intelligence or intellectual capacity, which, through the processes of perceiving, comparing, and judging, arrives at certain conclusions. Enough has been said, we presume, to show that these conclusions are as rational, as firm, and as operative when drawn from human testimony, as when derived from any other source whatever.

Conclusions may be either true or false. An individual may draw wrong conclusions from the evidence of his senses, as well as from human testimony. A distempered eye will communicate false impressions, as a perverted witness will give false testimony. And even when the senses are sound, or the witnesses true, a prejudiced mind may form an erroneous judgment, either from want of attention to the evidence submitted; from a deficiency of evidence, or from unfounded prepossessions by which the evidence is neutralized or perverted.

A true conviction arising from the exercise of the senses is termed *knowledge.* A true conviction arising from oral or written testimony is denominated *faith.* Belief is a term, which, though strictly applicable only to the latter, is often applied to the former, and has therefore become more general and indefinite. No distinction between knowledge and faith, drawn from the comparative certainty of these convictions, can be lawful, or just, nor should it in any case be permitted. They are distinguishable only by the sources from whence they are derived. The one springs from the exercise of our own senses; the other from the testimony of witnesses. The one is the confidence we have in the existence of things perceived by ourselves; the other, the confidence we have in the existence of things perceived by others. Faith, then, is knowledge at second hand—a confidence or assurance communicated to us by others, instead of being acquired by ourselves. No essential difference, then, can possibly exist between these convictions, in regard to their character or nature; so that while knowledge is correctly defined from its origin, The confidence we have in things presented to our senses; faith is by contrast 'A confidence in things unseen,' which, from the necessity of the case, can be derived only from oral or written testimony.

Faith and Knowledge stand for convictions which are equally true and indubitable. In each case, the respective evidence of the witnesses or of the senses is in proper measure, and of the proper character; and perceived, compared, and judged by a mind sound and free from bias. Knowledge may be considered the virtuous medium between ignorance and speculation: Faith the proper point between disbelief and credulity. Both, like moral virtues, admit of vicious extremes, for which they, in like manner, are not unfrequently mistaken. Knowledge is confounded with ignorance, and speculation becomes a substitute for both. On the other hand, the credulous man believes every thing, while the unbeliever credits nothing. The convictions of the man of science are the effect of full and impartial examination of sensible objects: those of the man of faith, the result of an equally full and impartial examination of testimony. Nothing short of sufficient sensible evidence can produce true knowledge; and true faith can never exist but where there is full and adequate testimony. A certain amount of evidence is necessary in each case, and the same amount in similar circumstances. If different minds require different degrees of evidence, it is because they are not equally well regulated. There is a certain quantum of evidence which ought to produce conviction, whether faith or knowledge, in every one; just as there is a certain degree of light in which every one should be able to see clearly. If any do not see,

it is because of a morbid condition of the organs of vision; and if any do not believe when the proper evidence is presented, it argues a depraved or vicious state of mind. So is it also with him who sees more than is presented to view, as with him who believes more than is proved.

It might prove interesting to consider and analyze the various states of mind which are unfavorable to the reception of truth. This subject, however, we leave for the present to the reflections of the reader; it being sufficient for our purpose to observe that the amount of evidence necessary to produce conviction will vary as the condition of the mind is more or less favorable. Paul was so "exceedingly mad" against the saints, that nothing short of overwhelming evidence could convince him of the truth of Christianity. But when one is already disposed, from any cause, to believe a matter, it requires but little evidence to convince. Both these states of mind are unfavorable to the reception of truth. Upon the former the degree of evidence really necessary for proof will make no impression; while the latter, being under the influence of credulity, cannot present to a well-balanced mind adequate proof of what he himself believes.

In considering evidence in relation to different states of mind, there is one matter which deserves particular notice. This is, that the state of mind has a very great influence upon the *attention*. When the mind is engrossed with some favorite idea or pursuit, the attention is preoccupied; and it is often impossible to change the state of the mind by evidence, because it is impossible to arrest and engage the attention so as to have this evidence duly considered. Many things then become necessary, as the means of engaging the attention, which are by no means necessary as evidence of the thing to be proved. This is found to rest upon, and to be proved by its own evidence so soon as the attention is directed to it.

Three things, then, are necessary to true conviction—viz. sufficient evidence, a proper degree of attention, and an unbiassed mind. And these are as necessary in the production of knowledge as of faith. It matters not how good our eyes, we can see only those objects to which we direct our vision. It matters not how good our sense of touch, we can feel only the objects which are subjected to its action. Sufficient examination is the result of proper attention, and will always, where the mind is free, lead to just conclusions.

Whenever it is admitted that oral or written testimony can, when in proper measure and duly considered by an unprejudiced mind, produce true conviction, it is granted that it is fully equal in its results to sensible evidence. For sensible evidence can do no more. A man

cannot be more than fully convinced. A proposition cannot be rendered more certain after it is fully proved. Nothing can be more than true. That this is admitted in word and action by men we have shown. And that in the nature of things the former is as well fitted to accomplish the object as the latter, we have proved by comparing these two kinds of evidence.

No difference can then, as before stated, exist between the conviction called faith, and that termed knowledge in point of nature or character. Neither are more than full and complete conviction. Neither are less. Hence the one cannot be distinguished from the other by the effects which they respectively produce. The convictions of the Apostles were from what they saw and heard—from sensible evidence. They *knew* the gospel to be true. But their convictions in this respect were not at all different either in nature, degree, or result, from the convictions of those who believed their report.

All that is necessary in any case is that the mind be perfectly assured. The conviction, in whatever way it may have been produced, will lead to corresponding action. Were we, indeed, as observed, to judge of faith and knowledge by the effects which follow them, faith would bear away the palm. The senses make us acquainted with the world. This is our knowledge. Testimony makes us acquainted with things unseen and eternal. This is our faith. And this faith overcomes the world, and leads men to despise and disregard it. But this victory is attained not by any thing superior in the nature of faith, but by the superior value of the objects which it presents.

R. R.

THOUGHTS ON EVIDENCE—*No. X.*

If oral or written testimony were insufficient to produce true conviction, either scepticism would cease to be a vice, or credulity would become the only substitute for faith. There could be no impropriety in doubting what could be no more than probable; nor, where doubt could be rationally entertained, could there be any conviction except from credulity. But if oral or written testimony be sufficient to produce true conviction, and is therefore, as we have shown, equal to sensible evidence, it follows that to disparage or reject it, would be as criminal as it would be to reject sensible evidence. If a man were to refuse to credit the existence of an object fairly presented to his senses, we should reasonably conclude that his mind was perverted. And would it not be as criminal and as strongly indicative of a disturbed mind, to reject the evidence necessary to faith, when presented in full and sufficient measure?

The oral evidence necessary to full conviction is, by an authority to which all must bow, adjudged to be that of two or three witnesses. And human experience coincides with the divine decree, in deciding that such evidence can never be set aside. Our Lord therefore regards the Apostles as highly censurable because they believed not those who had seen him after his resurrection; but remained obstinately incredulous although furnished with sufficient proof. For it is manifestly as great an evidence of a disturbed or prejudiced mind to be unmoved by sufficient proof, as it would be to believe upon insufficient testimony. He justly upbraided them, therefore, with "unbelief and hardness of heart."

When the proper evidence is presented to the mind, nothing but obstinacy can prevent conviction. Inattention, or weakness of understanding may hinder the presentation of full evidence to the mind; but where the attention is active, and the evidence adapted to the comprehension, nothing, as before said, but stubbornness can prevent conviction. Now as obstinacy is dependent upon the will, and is indicative of an evil state of mind, it is in all cases highly criminal and offensive to God; and disbelief, which can truly proceed from it alone, becomes an offence of the highest magnitude. "Rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry." Obstinacy is the wilful and wicked resolution to resist lawful authority. It contains within itself the essence of all criminality, and can never proceed from any but an evil motive. It prevents men from yielding to evidence, so that they remain unbelievers; or, if they have believed, it hinders them from yielding to their convictions, so that they continue disobedient. Men are consequently as accountable for their disbelief as for their disobedience.

"I *will not* believe upon the testimony of others," is the language of either obstinacy or ignorance. Such was the language of Thomas: 'I *will not* believe without sensible evidence—unless I see and feel the print of the nails,' &c. Was he approved for this? Here faith and knowledge—the evidence of witnesses, and the evidence of sense, were put in competition as means of full assurance. Did human testimony here prove less worthy of credit than sensible demonstration? By no means. The fact was found to be precisely as reported; and while the incredulity of Thomas was reproved as blameworthy, the blessing was pronounced upon those who should believe upon human testimony, which was thus declared to be a full and sufficient ground of assurance.

In the case of divine communications to men by angelic beings, or accompanied by visible tokens of the divine presence, consentient

evidence is obviously unnecessary. Here statement is also proof, whenever it becomes evident that the message or messenger is from heaven, inasmuch as the declarations of God cannot possibly err.—Incredulity with respect to this evidence is as displeasing to God, as unwillingness to believe the two or three witnesses in the case of human testimony, because it indicates the same prejudiced or obdurate state of mind. We have an illustration of this in Zacharias the father of John the Baptist, who was punished with a loss of speech because he would not believe the testimony of the angel. "Behold," said the latter, "thou shalt be dumb, and not able to speak, until the day that these things shall be performed, *because thou believest not my words*, which shall be fulfilled in their season."

Mankind are clearly accountable, then, for the reception which they give to evidence. As the attention is under the influence of the will, they are inexcusable if they fail to attend to and examine it when presented in relation to duty. No less so are they if after examination they perversely refuse to be convinced by good and sufficient proof. And certainly their case is no otherwise, if, after examination and conviction, they obstinately refuse to follow out their convictions.

R. R.

ATONEMENT—*No. IV.*

Brother Campbell,

In my last number I was still prosecuting the subject of the death or sacrifice of Christ, showing its effects on the believing sinner. I was particular, perhaps unnecessarily so, in showing the effects of the Levitical sin-offerings, and of the offering of Christ Jesus, on man and things; yet to set the subject in as clear a light as I can, I will add a few things more from the same source—the Bible.

Another effect of the blood of Christ on man, is, that by it, man is *redeemed*, *bought*, *purchased*, or *ransomed*. Tit. ii. 14. "Who gave himself for us, that he might *redeem* us from all iniquity." 1 Peter i. 18. "Ye were not *redeemed* with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." Eph. i. 1. 7.; Col. i. 14. "In whom we have redemption in his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." Hos. xiii. 14. "I will *ransom* them from the power of the grave, I will redeem them from death." Rev. v. 9. "For thou wast slain and hast *redeemed* us to God by thy own blood"—not from God. Rom. viii. 33.; Heb. ix. 12.; Gal. iii. 13. 1 Cor. vi. 20. & vi. 23. "Ye are *bought* with a price." 2 Peter ii. 1.; Acts xx. 28. "Feed the church of the

Lord, which he hath *purchased* with his own blood." Matth. xx. 28.; Mark x. 45. "Even as the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and give his life a *ransom* for many." 1 Tim. ii. 6.

These expressions have been taken literally by many, as in commercial affairs, a *quid pro quo* in scholastic style. They are not to be understood in the preceding texts literally, but figuratively, as we shall show by the scriptures. God is often said to sell his people for their iniquities; when nothing more is intended than that he suffered their enemies to prevail against them, and bring them into bondage and distress. Judges ii. 14. "And the anger of the Lord waxed hot against Israel, and he *sold* them into the hands of their enemies round about." See also Judges iii. 8.; iv. 2, 9.; 4 Sam. xii. 9. When the Lord had delivered these people thus *sold*, he is said to have *bought*, *purchased*, *redeemed*, and *saved* them. Exod. xv. 16. "Fear and dread shall fall upon them, till the people pass over, O Lord, till the people pass over which thou *hast purchased*." Deut. xxxii. 26. "Do ye thus requite the Lord? O foolish people, and unwise! Is he not thy Father that has *bought* thee." Ps. lxxiv. 2. "Remember thy congregation which thou *hast purchased* of old." Deut. vi. 8. "The Lord has brought you out with a mighty hand, and *redeemed* you out of the house of bondmen, from the hand of Pharaoh, king of Egypt." Deut. ix. 26. & xxiv. 18.; Exod. vi. 6. & xv. 2.; 2 Sam. ii. 23. Thus God's creatures are in the New Testament said to be *sold* under sin; and those thus sold, when freed are said to be *delivered* and *redeemed* from sin, *bought*, *purchased*, and *ransomed*, or *saved*. Rom. vii. and references.

These expressions mean nothing more than deliverance and salvation; so Moses understood them, and certainly he is the best interpreter of his own language: Exod. iii. 8. "I am come down to *deliver* them out of the hand of the Egyptians." Exod. xiv. 30. "Thus the Lord *saved* Israel that day out of the hand of the Egyptians," &c. So the Prophets understood those expressions. Mich. iv. 10.; Jer. xv. 20.; Isai. l. 2.; Ps. cvi. 8, 10.; Neh. ix. 27, *et passim*. And so did the New Testament writers. Acts vii. 34.; Romans xi. 26. This sense of the words is used in common parlance. Thus we say, Our liberty or salvation from British oppression was *purchased* by the blood of our fathers. No one understands by this expression that our fathers literally gave their blood to Britain as a stipulated price for our redemption.

We will now inquire—1st. Who is the *redeemer*, the *buyer*, the *purchaser*, the *ransomer* of the people? All will say, that God by the hand of Moses redeemed and purchased Israel from Egyptian bondage. Ps. lxxviii. 35., with the references above. Under the New Testa-

ment the same God is the Redeemer by his Son Jesus Christ. 1 Cor. i. 30. "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and *redemption*.

2d. From what does God *redeem* by his Son? I answer in the language of the scriptures already cited, he redeems from all iniquity—from our vain conversation—from the curse of the law, and from death and the grave.

3d. By what means does God by Christ deliver, or redeem us? I answer, By the life, death, resurrection, and ascension of the great Mediator Christ Jesus. This was the will of God, which will Jesus executed, and by which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus once for all. Heb. x. 7–10.

God redeems none but such as believe, repent, and obey the gospel; for to none else is remission of sins granted; and Paul teaches that redemption and remission of sins are tantamount expressions. Eph. i. 7.; Col. i. 14. "In whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." Therefore none are redeemed from sin but the obedient believer.

There are two things from which we are redeemed without faith, repentance, or obedience; which are, the curse of the law, and the grave. The Jews (for they only were under the law) were redeemed from the curse of the law by the death of Jesus on the cross; for by this the law received its fulfilment and end. Christ was the end of the law—he nailed it to his cross, and took it out of the way. The Jews are "delivered from that law, it being dead wherein they were held"—that covenant waxed old and vanished away. As this was effected without faith, so is redemption from the grave; for all, the good and evil, shall rise again from the dead. By the one offence, or by the disobedience of one man, Adam, the condemnation to death came upon all; so by the righteous obedience of one, Jesus Christ, the justification to live again, or to rise from the dead, comes upon all Rom. v.

Another inquiry of importance naturally rises from these premises: What connexion is there between faith, and all those divine effects of the blood of Christ before mentioned; as cleansing, sanctification, justification, redemption, &c.? I answer, To believe in Christ crucified, is not merely to believe that he died on Calvary; for a person may believe this, and weep at a pathetical description of the tragical scene, and yet his heart remain unsanctified from sin. The same person might weep at the description of Emmet's death, if a Curran were the orator. The quantum of religion would be equal in both cases; that is, none at all; unless sympathy be called religion. We must

know the designs of the death of Jesus before we can be rightly affected by it. To believe therefore aright in Jesus Christ crucified, is to believe in the designs of his death. Of these designs I will now inquire.

1st. One design of his death was, to take the law or old covenant out of the way:. Eph. ii. 13, 15.; Col. ii. 14.; Rom. vii. 1–6; Heb. viii. 13. & x. 9., &c. The last pointed to Christ, and the glory that should follow. When he died and rose again, he became the end of the law—it was fulfilled, and died with him—the priesthood was changed, then of necessity, there was also made a change of the law. The law being dead and vanished away, of course its curse and transgressions are also removed; for where there is no law there is no transgression, nor curse. "And for this cause he is the Mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first Testament, they who are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." Heb. ix. 15. The middle wall of partition is broken down between the Jew and Gentile. Eph. ii. 14.

2. Another *design* of the death of Jesus was to bring in and establish the New Testament, or to bring in everlasting righteousness to all the nations of the world. Gal. iii. 8–14. "Christ has redeemed us (Jews) from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us, (by dying on the cross)—That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith." Now the blessing of Abraham was the gospel, preached to him 430 years before the law; which gospel is, that "in thee and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." Before his death he forbade his disciples to preach the gospel to the Gentiles; but after his death and resurrection he gave them a new commission—to go into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. Now "where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force when men are dead, otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth. Heb. ix. 16, 17. A man may make his last Will and Testament years before his decease, in which he bequeaths certain portions of his estate to his children; but they have no right to the bequests while the father lives; but as soon as he, the testator dies, every legatee has a full right to the bequeathed inheritance. So while Jesus the testator lived, the blessings bequeathed in his last Will and Testament to the Gentiles could not be given to them; but after he died every creature of the human family has a right to all the blessings of the everlasting covenant. But, alas! how many, like Esau, sell

their birth-right to such a rich inheritance for one morsel of vanity! Yet let all know that the New Testament is dedicated by blood, and now in full force.

3d. Another design of the death of Jesus was to effect the resurrection. "I lay down my life that I might take it again"—i e. 'I die that I may rise again: "as Jesus died and rose again, even so them that sleep in Jesus will God bring with him." When he rose from the dead, he wrested from the hands of death and the grave those keys which would forever have locked the grave upon all the dead—there would have been no resurrection to all eternity. When he died and rose again, the bondage through fear of death was removed—then by his own blood he passed from the worldly sanctuary through the veil into the holiest of all, into heaven itself, and consecrated for us a new and living way to follow him there. Now, like holy Stephen, we look into heaven, and rejoice in the hope of immortality.

4th. Another design of his blood is to display the love, grace, and goodness of God to the world. Rom. v. 8. "But God commendeth his love towards us, in that when we were yet sinners Christ died for us." "Hereby perceive we the love of God, because he laid down his life for us." 1 John iii. 16.; 2 Cor. v. 14, 15.; Heb. ii. 9., &c.

5th. He died and rose again also to fulfil the scriptures that were written in the Law, in the Prophets, and in the Psalms concerning him. Luke xxiv. 26, 44. "And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled which were written in the law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms concerning me." "Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?"—The Prophets predicted his death, burial, resurrection, and ascension to glory. To these the Apostles appealed in proof of Christ being the Messiah—and in these they laid the foundation of the Christian's faith.

6th. Another design of his death was for our example. 1 Peter ii. 21. "For Christ hath also suffered for us, leaving us an example that ye should follow his steps." Heb. xi. 2.

7th. Another design of his death is to condemn sin, and fulfil the righteousness of the law in us. Rom. viii. 3, 4. "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin (*perei hamartias, for a sin-offering,*) condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in (not *for us,*) who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." In the text, instead of *for sin,* I have rendered it *for a sin-offering,* according to your version, and king

James' translation of Heb. x. 6, 8. The propriety of this the learned will not dispute. The law pointed out duty, but was too weak in its motives to have it performed—it could not purge the conscience—it could not make perfect—it could not justify—it was not possible for it to take away sin. While the subjects of the law were groaning in bondage, and writhing under the galling yoke, God in pity and love sent his only begotten Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for a sin-offering, in order to effect two grand purposes—to condemn sin, and save the sinner.

Christ dwelling in flesh condemned the world by his perfect righteousness, as did Noah of old. He condemned the world especially by his death, or offering for sin. Jesus, the most perfect, spotless, holy, lovely being the sun ever looked upon, was hated, defamed, persecuted, condemned, and slain by the wicked under the influence of sin—they hated him without cause—they persecuted him for righteousness' sake—they slew him because their own deeds were evil, and his righteous—they were the servants of sin, which reigned over them and in them, and instigated them to cry, "Away with him, away with him, crucify him, crucify him!" The horrid deed was done. Now who in heaven, or in the intelligent universe, but must condemn sin, the author of this wickedness? Jesus was the very image and character of God. In hating him, sin also hated the Father—in persecuting and putting him to death, sin has shown what it would do, had it power—it would instigate its servants to persecute and destroy from the universe the God of all—would annihilate his throne, and chase to eternal destruction all holy beings in heaven and earth—it would fill the universe with pain and misery, and cause the clouds of desperation forever to brood over all.

The Jews at Pentecost, when convinced that Jesus whom they crucified was the Son of God, were convinced of sin, and cried out, What shall we do? The malignity and evil of sin are pre-eminently seen in the cross. There too we see God's hatred to sin; for in order to destroy it, he spared not his own Son from death, but freely delivered him up for us all—that through death he might destroy him that had the power of death, that is the devil, and deliver us from bondage through the fear of death.

By Christ dwelling in the likeness of sinful flesh, and being a sin-offering, God also fulfilled the righteousness of the law in us—i. e. he sheds abroad the love of God in our hearts by the Holy Spirit given unto us—to us who believe and obey the gospel; or who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

These glorious truths the blood of Jesus speaks; for it has a voice,

and "speaketh better things than the blood of Abel." But the scriptures give his blood the voice: for without the scriptures we had not known the designs of the blood. The word and blood speak the same things, and are confirmed the one by the other. *The New Testament in my blood* is the same New Testament in the word, and the same effects are attributed to each. John xvii. 17; Gal. ii. 16; 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, &c.

Thus have I shown the designs of the death of Christ, and the divine effects of it on man. It has been proved that his blood purges, cleanses, sanctifies, washes, and purifies from sin—that by it sin is put away, borne away, taken away—that by it we are justified, pardoned, redeemed, ransomed, bought, purchased, delivered and saved from sin—by it we are propitiated, or saved from enmity, reconciled, and *at-one-ed* to God. By it—I need not repeat all I have written in this and the preceding numbers. All these effects are the work of God in us and for us, by the means of the sacrifice of Christ; and obedient believers only are the subjects of them. All are obliged to admit that what I have said on these points is true. But they think that the virtue of the sacrifice extended even to God *directly*, so as to reconcile, to propitiate, and pacify him to sinners, to satisfy the demands of the broken law and offended justice, &c. Let these be proved to be the designs and effects of Christ's sacrifice on God, his law, and government; let them be proved from scriptures, the source whence I have drawn all my proof, and I shall be among the first to receive them. Reason, philosophy, the traditions of fallible men, and sophistry will avail nothing with me; yet I am well assured of their power on a certain class of men. The text in Romans iii. 24, 25., the refuge of all the reputed orthodox, shall be hereafter considered. Yet even admitting that something was done, that God could be just and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus; yet that something is not declared, nor is it stated that it was effected by sacrifice.

I deny not that something might have been done to produce the effect on God as just mentioned; yet that something I find not revealed; and I dare not be wise above what is written. There has been, and yet is a great deal of conjecture and speculation afloat on this unrevealed something, which I do consider repugnant to the plain scriptures of divine inspiration; yet he that believes the declaration of God from his mercy-seat Christ Jesus, that he can be just in justifying the ungodly, that believe in Jesus, and acts according to divine direction, that person will not be condemned, though he may not understand *the how* God can be just when he justifies the believer. If I admit not this, I should have gloomy presages of the world's future condition.

B. W. STONE.

LETTER III.—*To. B. W. STONE.*

BROTHER STONE:

My dear Sir—THAT the words *redeemed, bought, purchased, ransomed*, &c. are used figuratively, or only in part of their signification, when applied to Jews and Christians, is not only admitted, but affirmed by all intelligent men, whether orthodox or heterodox, Unitarian or Trinitarian, Old School or New. I have met with only one or two cavilling spirits that sought to take them commercially—who asked, To whom did Jesus pay the price of man's redemption? But it is nevertheless true that Jews and Christians have been literally bought, ransomed, &c. With the greatest propriety the Lord said to the Jews, "I gave Egypt for thy ransom, Ethiopia and Seba for thee." Isaiah xliii. 3. Deliver him from going down to the pit: I have found a ransom." Job xxxiii. 24. In the same sense "the son of man came to give himself a ransom for many—for all, to be testified in due time." The Lord as truly gave to destruction the first-born of Egypt for his first-born Israel, as ever a General gave a thousand talents for his captive soldiers. And we have not been redeemed by silver and gold; but nevertheless we have been redeemed by the blood of Christ, and have been "bought with a price"—not, indeed, with all the forms of a commercial transaction in mercantile style; but still as really and truly *bought, ransomed, redeemed*, &c. Such is the Bible style, and as such you very justly adopt it as apposite and authoritative. Your illustration is a good one—"Our liberty and salvation from British oppression were purchased by the blood of our fathers." We did not pay to Britain so many men for our liberty; and yet had these fathers not been men of courage and patriotism, and given up their lives to the demands of George III., our country had not been redeemed. Their lives were a part of the price of our redemption. And had not Jesus died for our sins and given himself a ransom for many, no one could have been redeemed from sin, for reasons fully declared in the Bible.

Jesus has redeemed us both *to* and *for* God—not only *for* him, but *to* him. You have quoted proofs of both. God appointed him a Saviour and Redeemer, and also accepted him as such. "*He spared not his own Son*" when his benevolence and his justice demanded the sacrifice. On this point also there is no difference.

By what *person* we are redeemed, from what evils, and by *what means*, are also matters on which we seem to have the same understanding.

There is, perhaps, a shade of difference in our acceptation of the word *redemption*—if, indeed, you mean to say that redemption and remission of sins are tantamount expressions. They may be nearly

so in one or two places; but certainly they are not naturally, necessarily, nor scripturally tantamount expressions. Redemption, as a generic term, includes remission of sins; but remission of sins does not include redemption in reason or scripture. The body is *redeemed* as well as the soul; besides, a person may be redeemed who needs no pardon. But of this again.

There is another verbal difference (perhaps it is not much more than verbal) in the next section. You say, "There are two things from which we are redeemed," (not pardoned!) "without faith, repentance, or obedience—the curse of the law and the grave." While the latter may be freely granted, the former may be doubted. The Jews only were under the law, you properly observe; consequently the curse of that law in all its fulness hangs over all them out of Christ. But he was made a curse for us, so far as hanging on a tree is a curse according to what was written. But was simply dying on a tree "the end and fulfilment of the law"? Was Christ the end of the law simply in the manner of his death? You quote from Romans vii. "The Jews are delivered from the law, it being dead wherein they were held." But it does not so read in my Greek Testament. It is, according to Mill, Bengelius, and Griesbach, "We being dead wherein we were held or tied to the law." We, not the law, have died, being buried and raised again in baptism. This is, however, a very subordinate matter, and I hasten to the burthen of your letter.

You say, and very justly, "To believe in Christ crucified is not merely to believe that he died on Calvary, but to believe in the *design* of his death." This is the very point to which I am glad that you have so directly come. You have wisely gone into it more fully than any other. I will therefore consider, and I wish our readers to consider all that you have said on this point with profound attention.

There are, in your view, *seven* distinct designs in the death of Christ. These are—

1st. To take the law out of the way. 2d. To bring in the New Testament. 3d. To effect the resurrection. 4th. To display the love of God. 5th. To fulfil the scriptures. 6th. To afford an example. 7th. To condemn sin and fulfil the righteousness of the law in us.

So far as you have gone all Christendom goes, orthodox and heterodox. Some will differ from you in the explanations you give, and in the application of the scriptures you quote; but that these seven are designs of Christ's death, all will admit. But that they are *the* designs, demands a very serious doubt.

To these I beg leave to add one of all-absorbing interest to my mind, viz.—*To expiate sin.* "Now once in the end of the world has he appeared to expiate sin;" or, as you prefer it, "to put away sin by

the sacrifice of himself." This, with me, is the great design of all the designs of the law, of the prophets, of the types, of the incarnation of THE WORD—"the *Word* that was made flesh," and obtained a body that he might as a priest have somewhat to offer. How you came to forget this, my good and venerable brother, I conjecture not. But that this is the paramount object of Christ's death, I doubt not you will, on recollecting yourself, cheerfully admit. "That Christ was once offered to *bear the sins* of many—that he *appeared* in a body *to put away sin*—and that after he had offered *one sacrifice for sins*, he sat down on the right hand of God, having *perfected forever* them that are sanctified," are the very burthen of the epistle to the Hebrews.

Indeed, this is the import of the law and the gospel. Daniel said, "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city to restrain the transgression—to make an end of sin-offerings—to make a propitiation or reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in an everlasting righteousness," &c. And Paul said, "By his own blood he obtained an everlasting redemption." These two passages are one in sense. The *everlasting righteousness* of Daniel and the *eternal redemption* of Paul are, in my judgment, two names for the same thing. Daniel said, In seventy weeks an everlasting righteousness shall be brought in; and Paul says, Having by his own blood obtained an everlasting redemption he sat down.* An eternal redemption is a redemption that is forever availing, which needs neither addition nor repetition. This is the foundation of an *everlasting justification*. Redemption in this sense is the cause—justification the effect. Sin-offerings are ended because reconciliation for iniquity is made, and a justification perfect and complete is brought in. The order is sin-offering, redemption, justification. The three are perfect; but the two last spring from the first. But here I must pause for the present.

Brother Stone, I am just set down in my chair, after an absence of two weeks, in attendance at our Ohio annual meetings. Your letter was received and partially printed in my absence, and I had written this much of my reply before I discovered that your third letter has never appeared in our pages. I informed you of its loss, and until I this moment received your note of the 1st instant, (September,) I did not know but that Letter IV. (having come in my absence) was your Letter III. Had not the form containing a part of your letter been printed off, and some of my reply in type, I should have laid it all over for a month. Any thing material in this transposition may be rectified again.———Sincerely and affectionately yours, A. C.

* *For us* is not in the Greek text. It is an awkward, uncalled for, and deceptious supplement.

OUR COURSE.

MANY brethren have besought us to pay no more attention to any thing in any of our periodicals on "*The Name*," nor to any thing concerning myself in "The Evangelist." The latter is already decided; and as the last "*cleansing of the sanctuary*" on *the name* has, after *conceding all that I argued for;* and placing the infallible evidence, not in Paul and Barnabas giving the name by divine authority, as before affirmed, but in their simply *being named Christians* IN THE PRESENCE OF PAUL—(a begging of the whole question, by the way: for no living man nor ancient record can show that Paul or Barnabas was in Antioch when the name was given, any more than that Agabus came from Jernsalem to Antioch while Paul was in that city, because the next fact on record)—I say, as the last notices of my essays have descended into undignified, unkind, and unchristian personalities, in which the words "finesse, logomachy, sophism, sarcasm, perversion, absurdity," &c. with many such specimens of "*perfection in self-examination and control*," and suspicioning of motives, are made to honor my efforts, I have concluded that if the brethren will not encourage others to impose a particular name as of divine authority upon us on pain of disparagement or disfranchisement, I will discuss the matter no farther. But they will please remember that I am not authorized by any power to stand by in silence and see others scatter the seeds of discord among us—arrogating to their opinions "infallible" authority. I cannot do *that*, much as I desire to gratify the weakest of our brethren. Such has not been my course hitherto; and I stake the past for the future. Let no one, then, expect to seal my lips or embargo my pen while he countenances and sustains others in the ways of discord and schism. There is no principle involved in this discussion as it now stands. I have never dogmatically sought to control any man's vote in this or any other question of expediency; I have only been giving my reasons in the present time for my choice, and demonstrating the groundless assumptions of those who would compel us to wear their choice on the ground of an exclusive divine warrant. May the Lord teach us to bear with Christian sympathy the weaknesses and imperfections of one another, and to stand off from the appearance of schism! It is too late to ask others to speak kindly to us after we have exhausted our quiver in dishonoring them, or to sue for peace after we have waged an unsuccessful and disastrous war!!

A. C.

From the Recorder & Watchman.

AN IMPORTANT QUERY.

IS NOT OUR LORD'S DAY THE PRIMEVAL SABBATH?

Dear Brother—You are well aware of the discussions which have arisen as to the Sabbath. To me the day seems distinct from the *Sabbath* and the appointment of the present first day sufficiently manifest under the Christian economy. I perceive in the letter of the Savannah River Association an important suggestion thrown out in passing, and in confirmation of it I send you the following extract from a writer of no small erudition:—

"We have thus far pursued our argument on the supposition that the first day of the week had never been observed as a Sabbath till after the resurrection of Christ. But there are not wanting reasons for the opinion that this was the day uniformly observed from the creation till the arrival of the Israelites in the wilderness of Sin, when a temporary change to the last day of the week was made by the authority of Heaven. We are aware that this opinion conflicts with a well-known answer in our Shorter Catechism. But while we would pay all due deference to the judgment of those who framed the formularies of our church, we shall never relinquish the right of thinking for ourselves in relation to all religious subjects. We are far from imagining that any creeds, catechisms, and liturgies are infallible. We look upon them just as we contemplate other human productions; remembering, too, that they were formed at a period in which the facilities for exploring scriptural truth were much inferior to those we now enjoy.

The works of creation were completed in six days, and on the seventh the Almighty rested from his labor. Now this day, which was set apart for sabbatical observance, being the first whole day of Adam's life, would be the era from which he would naturally begin his computation of time, and would, therefore, be the first day of his week. The first entire day of his existence he was commanded to offer as a species of first fruits to his God. The day was certainly the seventh from the creation; but it was probably reckoned as the first day of the week. That the primeval Sabbath was the first day of the week, might be inferred from the fact, that when mankind forsook the worship of the true God, the recollection of this day was preserved, and mingled itself with their superstitions. They continued to observe the first day of the week as a season for religious solemnities. In general it was devoted to the idolatrous worship of the *Sun*, and it was therefore called *Sunday*. The same observance of the first day of the week still prevails among the heathen nations of the east.

The arguments arising from the fact which we have just mentioned, is undoubtedly a most cogent one. The hebdomadal, or weekly division of time, not being indicated by any natural phenomenon, is purely artificial. And yet this division has existed from the earliest ages of which we have historical record, and is found to be co-extensive with the diffusion of the human species. Now may we not demand, whence could this arbitrary division of time have arisen, except from the original institution of the Sabbath immediately after the creation. This

circumstance, we think, sufficiently refuted the opinion of those who consider the Sabbath as a peculiarity of the Mosaic ritual; while the general observance throughout the world of the first day of the week, as a season for religious ceremonies of some sort, would seem to demonstrate that the primitive Sabbath corresponded with that day.

We have intimated that the Sabbath was changed from the first to the last day of the week on the arrival of the Jews in the wilderness of Sin. In proof of this we appeal to the 16th chapter of Exodus, where several remarkable circumstances are recorded. The manna on which the Israelites subsisted during their pilgrimage from Egypt to Canaan began to fall from heaven soon after they reached the wilderness just mentioned. On the morning of the sixth day of the week double the usual quantity of manna was found lying on the ground. The people, surprized at an occurrence so wholly unexpected, went to Moses to inquire what it could mean. He told them that the next day would be their Sabbath, on which it would be unlawful for them to gather the miraculous food. Now from this whole transaction some have drawn the inference that the Sabbath was previously unknown to the Israelites. It has been thought that their ignorance in respect to the reason why they had received a double allowance on the sixth day—together with the manner in which Moses then enjoined on them the religious observance of the seventh day, can hardly be accounted for on any other supposition. We admit, indeed, that if the Jews had always been accustomed to observe the seventh day of the week as a Sabbath, their slowness of comprehension in this affair was strange. But if we suppose that the first day of the week had been their original Sabbath, which was now changed to the seventh, the difficulty vanishes.

Is it asked why the change which we suppose to have taken place with regard to the Sabbath was introduced? We answer, For two obvious reasons; one of which was to distinguish the Israelites from the surrounding Pagan nations, who, as we have said, celebrated the idolatrous worship of the Sun on the first day of the week. Another was to commemorate the deliverance of the Jews from Egyptian bondage, which might be considered as occurring on the seventh day. And hence in the repetition of the ten commandments which we find in the book of Deuteronomy, the observance of the Sabbath is enforced by the following consideration:—

"Remember that thou wast a servant in Egypt, and that the Lord thy God brought thee out thence through a mighty hand, and by a stretched out arm; therefore, the Lord thy God commanded thee to keep the Sabbath day." Hence also the Jewish Sabbath was denominated *a sign*. The rest which it afforded them was emblematical of their emancipation from servitude.

Now if the first day of the week had been the primitive Sabbath, it was unnecessary for our Lord to give his Apostles and disciples an express command for the religious observance of that day. By his resurrection the Mosaic economy was abrogated, and the Sabbath, as a matter of course, would revert to the original day. Christians, what dignity does the view which we have here taken confer on your Sabbath! You celebrate the day on which your Creator rested from his works, while the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy. You also celebrate the day on which your Redeemer,

having completed the sacrifice of your redemption, arose in triumph from the tomb, and manifested his victory over the powers and principalities of darkness. Your Sabbath and the patriarchal are the same. In short, the day which you observe is rendered illustrious by the two most memorable events in the annals of time—the creation and redemption of the world. We may add, that such seems to be the purport of the Apostle's argument in his epistle to the Hebrews, where he says,—"There remaineth, therefore, a rest for the people of God: for he (Jesus) that is entered into this rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from his." Nor is it unworthy of remark, that so early a writer as Justyn Martyr has expressly said that the first day of the week was, in his time, universally observed as a Sabbath, because it was the day in which God finished the work of creation, and in which Jesus Christ our Saviour arose from the dead. Such is the language of a writer who lived in the second century, and who, therefore, may be presumed to have been acquainted with the opinion of the Apostles—so far, at least, as tradition had preserved it.

O.

We have not now room for comment on the above. It is due to Mr. Fuller, of South Carolina, who spoke so disrespectfully of our views, and on whose allusion to this subject we made some remarks not acceptable to him, that his reasons for speaking of the first day Sabbath as he did, should go to our readers. A. C.

News from the Churches.

Palestine, Illinois, August 22, 1840.

Since I gave you an account of the debate between brother Trimble and Newport, our congregation has increased to 78; and at Hutsonville, 9 miles above this, brother Tichenor has ingathered and constituted a congregation with between 40 and 50 members. He has also, within six or eight weeks, constituted a church at Darwin, in Clark county, adjoining our county, with 23 or 24 members. Several of the additions at Hutsonville and Darwin were from the Methodists, embracing the very bone and sinew of that denomination. Brothers Trimble and Tichenor are indefatigable in their labors. Brother Tichenor also constituted a church last week, near Grand View, in Edgar county, Illinois, of 11 choice spirits, and during the meeting there were 5 additions; and the seed sown upon that occasion will doubtless yet redound to the ingathering of many more valuable additions. ALFRED G. LAGOW.

Greensburg, Indiana, July 25, 1840.

Although politics seem to be the order of the day with us, yet there are some that are thinking of eternal things in this section of country. In Greensburg, south of me five miles, there have been since last fall about 50 accessions to the congregation. The third Lord's day in September, 1839, we organized a congregation of 10 members one mile north of where I live. We have had nothing like a great excitement at any time, but our number has increased to upwards of 40 disciples. We have but one Elder (which is the undersigned) and two Deacons, brethren G. McLaughlin and G. Carey. We meet only as yet twice-a-month to break the commemorative loaf; but we trust it will not be long till we shall on every Lord's day meet in the house of the Lord in whom we rejoice; whom having not seen, we love. We have no house but a school-house yet; but we are about to build a house for the Lord's family. The prospect is very good for an increase of his children. We have been made to rejoice at the most of our meetings this spring and summer—one or more confessing and putting on the Lord Jesus. Two sisters were immersed last Lord's day—one of whom had been a member of the Methodist church for thirty years. Her companion had been immersed two weeks before, who had been a teacher among them for many years. O that men would praise the Lord for his goodness and wonderful works to the children of men! ZENAS DARNALL.

Bloomington, Indiana, August 7, 1840.

The good cause to which you and I are devoted, is gradually gaining ground in Indiana, as you may see by reference to our statistics. We have had some excellent meetings in this county lately. Since the first of April I have had the pleasure of baptising some 35 persons at the different points where I have labored. J. M. MATHES.

Wadsworth, Ohio, July 16, 1840.

There have been 125 baptized within the bounds of my labors since the middle of September last, about one half of whom were immersed when I held meeting in company with others. We thank the Lord that the above number have yielded to the Prince of Peace. A. B. GREEN.

Georgetown, Kentucky, August 11, 1840.

Since I returned home from Green River I have been called to the assistance of brother Gano at Cynthiana, where he had been holding a meeting of several days including the days of the election. I reached there on Wednesday. Brother Gano had obtained 13 additions, and was compelled to leave. I regretted it deeply; but I labored on until yesterday, with the assistance of brother Irvine part of the time. We obtained in all 24 valuable accessions. Praised be the name of the Lord! Brother Gano came on to his appointment at this place, and, as I am informed, obtained 3 more Since the first of March we have obtained upwards of 100 additions at Cynthiana. The cause is succeeding wherever it is plead in a proper spirit. May the Lord speed it onward! is my most fervent prayer. J. T. JOHNSON.

Green Village, Columbiana county, Ohio, August 24, 1840.

You may let the beloved brethren know the condition of the congregation in Green, if you think fit We are greatly refreshed from the presence of the Lord, and the prospect for doing good at this time is more flattering than heretofore A three days meeting commenced on the 15th instant, the results of which were truly refreshing to our brethren and interesting to all that attended with us; and truly our congregations were crowded. Brother C. Vanvoris, our evangelist for this county, and brother John Whitacre were the laborers with us, and their efforts were crowned with 16 immersions into Jesus Christ for the remission of sins during said meeting. We have had 28 added to the saved within five weeks. Success attends the labors of our brother Vanvoris throughout the county. JOHN FLICK.

OUR MEETINGS IN THE WESTERN RESERVE.

We attended the meetings in Warren and in Euclid, Ohio, held annually, in the last week of August and first week of September. Both meetings were well attended with public laborers. Present at Warren were, brethren C Bosworth J. Hartsill, J. Henry, S. Church, E. Williams, A. Allilon, M. Clapp, Dr. Robinson, A. S. Hayden, C. Rider, G. P. Collins, M. Martin, C. McNeely, Z. Rudolph, —— Brockett, W. Beaumont, J. Kirk, J. Vanvooris, —— Sturdevant, and Dr. A. W. Campbell Besides a number of these, there werepresent at the Euclid meeting, Elder A. Bentley, W. Hayden, J. J. Moss and others.

Many disciples were in attendance, and a large promiscuous congregation. There were immersed at the Warren meeting, forty-three. As I left before the close Euclid meeting, I cannot report its progress. During the last year very large additions have been made to many churches. From a number of detailed statements we concluded that the number of disciples on the Reserve has nearly, or altogether, doubled during the last year. The churches also are in the very best order they have hitherto enjoyed A becoming zeal and a great deal of brotherly kindness and cordial affection for the truth's sake prevail among the brethren We had very little to mar our enjoyments at these meetings. There appears a better foundation for usefulness and permanent prosperity in the Lake counties than at any former period. The churches have learned in the school of experience some valuable lessons, and I trust they will continue to bring their stock to a good market and turn it to good account.

There is much wanting, however, to bring things up to the original model. More zeal, more prayer, more Bible reading and teaching in our families; more pious conversation—much less conformity to the world; more gravity, sincerity, and diligence in the proclamation of the word; more strict order in our meetings, especially in the weekly celebrations of the supper; more socialism in all Christian privileges; and especially more *spirituality* in every thing; more diligence to make our calling and election sure; and more respect for those who sincerely differ from us in opinion.

The laborers have been more industrious, more engaged, and consequently more successful during the present season. Brother William Beaumont has immersed some 75 in New Lisbon—Brother Henry 140 since the beginning of the year—brethren Wesley Lanphere and H. Jones have baptized many; and indeed all the laborers have reason to bless the Lord and to renew their courage in the glorious work of saving men. A. C.

DIFFICULTIES.

JAMESTOWN, O., August 6, 1840.

Dear brother Campbell—IN the elevated station you occupy, having all the light of literature and of the sayings of the strongest men of ancient and modern times before you, it must be that you frequently

meet with essays and objections from your contemporaries that it would show weakness in you to refute or expose. Therefore, out of pure regard for such you are compelled to pass over their essays and objections in silence.

In a former communication I stated some of my difficulties in relation to ordination or appointment to office in the church by the laying on of hands. In this I shall lay before you a few more of my difficulties. You contend for three distinct offices now in the church—the Bishop's office, the Deacon's office, and the Evangelist's office. If, then, a person be ordained to fill one of these offices, does his ordination authorize him to fill all of them? or, Does one ordination constitute a man a Bishop, a Deacon, and an Evangelist? If not, then how do you prove that Philip or Stephen were ever ordained Evangelists? Were not all the disciples who went every where preaching the word, Evangelists, as well as Philip and Stephen? Was not Apollos an Evangelist? Jf so, who ordained him? Were any of the Apostles ordained by the laying on of hands? In short, were there not hundreds, both male and female, who officiated in the primitive church, who were not ordained by the laying on of hands? What say you of re-ordination? If a man desire to remove from one place to another, having been ordained a Bishop or a Deacon, does his one ordination constitute him a Bishop or a Deacon in every place, and in all time future? If so, should he not take a certificate or diploma with him to establish his authority? These are difficulties enough for any student to present at one time. When these are overcome I will present others.

Yours affectionately, M. WINANS.

REPLY TO THE ABOVE.

BROTHER WINANS:

My dear Sir—A person ordained to any office is ordained to that office only, and only in one community. Offices in Christ's kingdom are not indelible or perpetual things. But various offices both in church and state may sometimes meet in the same person, though not in the same commission, nor in one and the same appointment or ordination.

One commission and one ordination for one office. Officers of high rank, as well as officers extraordinary, may indeed perform the duties of inferior officers. The Apostles were Evangelists, Bishops, and Deacons. Moses was a Prophet, Priest, and King, a Lawgiver and a Judge. The words Minister and Deacon are generic terms, and include all servaats of the church. Evangelists, Bishops, and Deacons are servants of the church.

It is not necessary nor obligatory to prove that every Evangelist was ordained: we need only show that the Holy Spirit commanded* the ordination of Paul and Barnabas when they were sent out as Evangelists. Unless, then, some reason can be given why these two, rather than other Evangelists, should have hands laid on them, it is logical and just to infer that all other Evangelists, whether Philip, or Timothy, or Apollos, were ordained in a similar manner. Can any one show a valid reason why Paul and Barnabas should have been separated and ordained to the work of Evangelists, rather than others who performed the duties of that office? Do we not need fasting, praying, and imposition of hands as much as they?

* Acts xiii. 1–5.

Every one who preaches the gospel in any way, public or private, may be called an Evangelist. Hence they who were persecuted into preachers, were so far Evangelists. But this term, as *a name of office*, designates other duties than simple preaching—it includes erecting and setting in order new communities and watching over them till they are able to take care of themselves.

No doubt many persons, in the first instance, officiated in various ways in the primitive church, who were not set apart to this office. But this is true of all communities in their incipient state. It was on the second or third visits that the Apostles ordained Bishops in the churches. Persons had officiated in the interim, but they were not invested with office.*

Touching your last query, having I believe replied to all the others, I have only room to say, that a Magistrate in Virginia when he migrates to Ohio is not a Magistrate there in virtue of his Virginia commission. Nor is a Bishop in Cincinnati a Bishop in Richmond, Va., in virtue of the call and imposition of hands of the church in Cincinnati. A man may be an Evangelist any where, having a commission into all the world; but a Bishop and a Deacon are the ministers of a stationary and organized community, and in office only so long as they serve it, in virtue of its ordination.

Baptists, Presbyterians, Methodists, &c., are in the habit of occasionally marrying a man before he gets a wife. They marry first, and he courts afterwards; or, to drop the figurative and come to the literal, they make a minister, and send him to look for a congregation. With them the clergy are a distinct order, a caste, a body; and consequently they sometimes make the *officer* first and seek the office afterwards. Nature does not make eyes for heads, or hands for bodies; but she makes the body and its members as they severally depend on one another. We ought not to go before, but to follow her example; for to this the word agrees. They ordained them elders in every *church*.

Most sincerely and affectionately yours, &c. A. C.

PRIZE ESSAY.

A correspondent of the National Intelligencer makes known to the American public that the "London Society for the promotion of permanent and universal Peace," offers a prize of 100 guineas for the best essay, and 20 guineas for the second best essay, on the following subjects:—

I. To show that war, under all circumstances, is inconsistent with the precepts of the gospel and the spirit of the Christian religion.

II. To point out the duties of magistrates and peace officers in cases of tumults, insurrections, and invasions, with the most effectual method of preventing such calamities.

III. To show the best means of settling all disputes between nations without recourse to arms.

☞ Elders B W. Stone, Thomas M. Allen, and Jacob Creath, Jr. have recommenced the *Christian Messenger* in Jacksonville, Illinois The first number will appear the present month (September.) Each volume will contain 12 numbers—each number 32 pages 12mo.—at $1,25 a volume, to be paid on the delivery of the 2d number Agents allowed one volume for every eight subscribers. Letters to Editors must be post-paid.—Patronage is solicited from our brethren and friends.

* Acts xiv. 23.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

NEW SERIES.

VOLUME IV.——NUMBER X.

BETHANY, VA. *NOVEMER*, 1840.

UNION.

Union, love, and social bliss, are only three ways of expressing the [illegible] idea. The glory that Christ gave his disciples is union with [illegible], as sons of God, and joint heirs with himself: "The glory which thou gavest me I have given them, that they may be one as we are, (I in them and thou in me,) that they may be made perfect in one."—Who that thinks of heaven, of eternal peace and love, can refrain from pleading the union, concert, and co-operation of all the sincere followers of the Lamb of God! Oh! that all the sons and daughters of our Father in heaven were as children of one family, cordially, firmly, and visibly united in one profession, all striving to honor and magnify the common Saviour, and seeking to convert the world to Christ! We see some signs in the sky: may the Lord brighten our prospects more and more!

The following remarks from brethren Coleman and Goss, editors of that valuable auxiliary in our commonwealth, *The Christian Publisher*, precede an extract on the subject of Union, from *The Baptist Banner*.*

AN ADDRESS TO THE BAPTISTS.

The article below is from the Baptist Banner, published in Kentucky. We copy it into our pages for the benefit of all our readers, but especially for the benefit of our Baptist friends. The sentiments contained in it are not new to us. They have been stereotyped by our brethren, and published throughout the Union for the last twenty years. We are glad to see, that, though they were despised at first, and thought to be visionary and impracticable, they are cherished by the Western Baptists, and have become the views for which they in futur are to contend.

* I am sorry that the Publisher is not more liberally supported, and more generally read in Virginia. Will our brethren allow it to retire from the contest when so much yet remains to be done?—A. C.

Will not the Baptists of Virginia co-operate with their Kentucky brethren in praying and laboring for this consummation, so devoutly to be wished for—THE UNION OF CHRISTIANS! What so ardently to be desired? We hope the sentiments in the extract below will find favor with Elders Broaddus and Taylor, and others of influence and standing with that body. Shall we be disappointed? And if the object is to be desired, do not all the sanctions of time and eternity call upon these brethren to move in the matter? They have the talent, learning, prudence, and, above all, the influence, which would go greatly towards securing the blessed object.

They give tone and temper to the great body of their brethren in a great measure. They have had to do, to a great extent, in producing the schism which has separated those in Virginia who practise the one immersion. Will they not atone for this misdirected agency in producing this unhappy division among the children of God, by rescinding all their decrees, and recommending through the same Associations the observance of friendship, forbearance, and Christian courtesy, where hatred, impatience, and heathen hostilities have heretofore been countenanced?

Let them not weigh the many difficulties that a worldly spirit might faint to encounter. I know that a considerable improvement in the *manners* of many of their brethren, as well as our own, would have to follow. But mutual forbearance and mutual co-operation, under the blessing of him who devoutly prayed for union, would soon expel the demon spirit of party, and establish the indwelling of peace and amity and brotherly kindness.

Union among believers is now desired, prayed for, and, to some extent, labored for by nearly all who love our Lord. But it is with seeming ill grace that we preach the practicability of a universal union among believers, while we perpetuate dissension among those who not only believe in the same Lord, but practise the same immersion. Let us, then, put our heads, our hearts, our hands together, and establish a union and co-operation among ourselves, and then we will be armed and supplied in all the strength of union and love, to persuade and induce our Paidobaptist friends to abandon all their sectarian and ungodly partialities, feelings, and practices, and unite in the *universal compact* of Christian love and Christian fellowship

We should be glad to hear from some of our God-fearing and peace loving brethren upon this subject. An interchange of sentiments might be useful to them, to us, and to all others, who think and pray about this momentous matter. Our pages are open to receive the thoughts and reflections of the pious and devout of all parties upon this subject. The evil of dissension, the good that would attend union, the difficulties in the way of bringing it about, and the best method of effecting the object, all furnish themes for the pens of the wise, the experienced, the philanthropic of all parties. Will not some of the experienced Elders in the Baptist fraternity embrace this opportunity to discourse our readers upon these thrillingly interesting points? Perhaps the aged and justly influential Andrew Broaddus might find it consistent with his views of propriety and usefulness, to give our readers his views and convictions upon these points. We should be pleased to have his views.

Extract from the Baptist Banner.

Can any man suppose for a moment that the present condition of Christendom is acceptable to the Saviour of men? Is all this war, division, strife, animosity, and brawling, what he suffered and died for? Is the present divided and separate state of the church that glorious condition for which he labored, and suffered, and died? Most assuredly not. Is the present situation of the body worthy of such a head as the Lord of glory? No Christian can lay his hand upon his heart and give an affirmative answer to this. Christ gave himself for the church that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word; that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." Eph. v. 26, 27. This state of the church would make a crown worthy of the Head of the Church; and it is in the power of men to bring it about. God has done every thing necessary for the holiness, the peace, the harmony of the church; she must now put her own hands to the work. Let no one say that he can do nothing in it; for every individual must cast in his mite in order to consummate the renovation of the church. A little leaven leavens the whole mass, and each individual has it in his power to do much. Let him inform his understanding thoroughly upon the means by which it is to be accomplished; then let him with firmness, prudence, and wisdom put those means into active exercise.

The body of Christ was once a united one, and in that condition gave laws to the world. It crushed every thing that opposed its progress until it was itself divided, and who can tell the mischiefs that have come from this division? Every right-minded Christian sees, feels, and hears enough of them daily, and all should earnestly set themselves to the task of bringing this state of things to a close. The Saviour, in that solemn invocation to the Father, called his intercessory prayer, prayed that the "Apostles, whom the Father had given him, might be one, even as we are one," and they were come in all the glorious duties that devolved upon them as Apostles of the Christian religion. If the reader wishes to see the fruits of the union, let him consult the condition of the world before this union commenced, and compare with it the results of the undivided labors of the first preachers of the Cross. Let him consult the Acts of the Apostles and the letters to the churches, and he will see glorious fruits abounding to the glory of God, the saviour and benefactor of sinners.

Again—he prayed "not for these alone; but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be *one* as thou Father *art* in me, and I in thee, that they also may be *one* in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me," John xvii. 20, 21. This prayer was answered by the Father—the saints were one—they "walked by the *same* rule; they minded the *same* thing." The first fruits of salvation were one and indivisible, and the world fell beneath their union, peace, and holiness. Paganism, with its millions of votaries; its hosts of priests; its lofty temples; its time-honored institutions; its incorporation with the policy and laws of empires, fell before the doctrine of the Cross. The union of the despised followers of Christ was irresistible, and will be again whenever it shall go forth over the earth as it did then. To this end Christians of the present

day should direct their efforts. Christ walked in sufferings upon the earth for our sake; he claims a crown as his reward, and that crown is the union and happiness of his followers.

How is this union to be effected? We answer, By the teachings of the Bible, and in no other way. That book teaches the necessity of forbearance and gentleness towards one another; and we must carry out these principles if we wish to see Christians united. The question may be asked, Would you compromise a Bible truth for the sake of union? We answer, Not one, because the Bible contemplates no such union. There are items upon which men cannot differ but to the destruction of the souls of one of the parties; but these are just the matters upon which Christians do not differ generally. There are other items upon which Christians differ, and tear, and rend, and divide the body of Christ with their differences, and these items have nothing to do with the salvation and enjoyment of Christians. These are the things for the destruction of which we pray; for they may be blotted from the world without making any human being the poorer from their destruction. We repeat the declaration, The basis for the union of Christians is plainly taught in the Bible: the superstructure that is built upon it may stand give comfort to all Christendom; and for this, we confess, we have strong desires."

Union in truth amongst all the baptized followers of the PRINCE OF PEACE, has been inscribed on our banner from the day of our Christian nativity till now. We not only pray for it, but we speak, write, and labor for it as a consummation devoutly to be sought. There is but one body of Christ, one spirit, and one hope, as there is but one God and Father of all; and *one Lord, one faith, and one baptism* are the basis of this sacred incorporation. "*We are all baptized into one body by one Spirit;* whether Jews or Greeks, whether slaves or freemen, we are all made to drink into one spirit." Christians, then, are radically, essentially, spiritually one; and ought not their union to be visible and manifest to all?

For this are to be given up three things—pride of party, or pride of understanding; the traditions of the Fathers; and our own opinions so far as they are bonds of union or communion. *In all these there is neither faith, nor piety, nor morality;* for all faith, piety, and morality are anterior to, distinct from, and independent of opinionism, whether in the form of our own inferences and speculations, or in that of human traditions or ecclesiastic canons. No truth of the Bible is necessarily to be sacrificed for union: errors, opinions, and traditions are indeed to be abandoned, and a becoming humility and deference to the opinions of others must be cultivated and displayed.

But what shall be done with Christian baptism? The advocates of union in all parties ask this question with profound interest and feeling. The Unionists of the present day are very sensitive and full of speculation on this point. Baptism in its relative aspects will become

as important to Christendom as in its *intrinsic value* and significance. There are three schemes before the public. One class of Unionists are Spiritualists, (Quakers in fact on this point.) The other class are the indifferent Methodists and Cumberlanders. They say, 'Sprinkle, pour, or dip.' The third are for *one baptism*, and only one.

Now which of these three systems is best adapted to the union of all men who believe the gospel, is a question of much practical importance. On that I shall offer but two arguments at present:—

1st. The Quakers and Methodists have tried their schemes of *spiritualism* and *indifferentism* for a considerable time, and the experiment shows that the Christian party in all parties cannot unite, never will unite on the one or the other of these two bases. They both, in fact, annihilate the ordinance as a *divine* institution, and convert it into a human expedient of little or no value.

2d. The conscientious and God-fearing, in all parties, never can give up a *believing immersion into Christ's gospel.* In proof of it see the thousands and tens of thousands annually taken from the best portions of Paidobaptism—I mean the most conscientious and intelligent of them. They who lay a scriptural emphasis on baptism outstrip all parties in their permanent and vigorous growth, and therefore the most logical conclusion is, that of the three—the Spiritualists, the Literalists, and the Compromisers—the literal believers and practisers of believing immersion will, as a union party, be more successful than either of the others. For example, let three missionaries of equal qualifications be sent out for one or more years into the same field to form a union party by actual proselytism of those who fear God, (and we want none else as members of a union party)—let one of them preach the compromise system of Methodists and Cumberlanders; another of them, the spiritual no-water system of the Quakers; and the other, the believing immersion of this reformation; and all experiments hitherto made authorize the conclusion that the latter will obtain more favor with the whole community than either or both the others. The reason is obvious to persons of reflection. So long as it is written there is but *one baptism*, the intelligent and conscientious will not accept a substitute for it, nor will they allow that a divine precept can be a matter of indifferenee to any man who expects to give an account of himself to God.

The *Paidobaptist* union party may be appealed to in proof of the justness of our reasonings and inferences on this momentous question. They can never succeed in effecting a union of any extent or permanence amongst believers—amongst those who "tremble at the word" of the Lord of hosts. As, then, an expedient to effect the union of

all good men in the bonds of one universal co-operation, to build up the walls of Zion, and to restore peace and prosperity to all her habitations, I argue it is the duty of all the true and loyal friends of Jesus to preach and teach one Lord, one faith, and one immersion into Christ for the remission of sins. *For twelve hundred years after Christ immersion for the remission of sins was the practice of the whole Christian world—Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans.* Remember I have said it, and can prove it from the most authentic records on earth. A. C.

From the Christian Publisher

JOHN M. DUNCAN ON FOREKNOWLEDGE.

We have just been perusing a book, entitled, "Lectures on the General Principles of Moral Government," by John M. Duncan, Pastor of the Associate Reformed Congregation of Baltimore. Mr. Duncan is a reformer from Presbyterianism, and certainly he has reformed to a considerable extent, though he has not been able to get out of the smoky city. Perhaps he would not admit, according to his views presented in the work to which allusion has been made, that he was not *able* to do what he ought to do; and, indeed, it does seem strange that a man who has made such attainments in other parts of the system, should not have discovered that the immersion of believers is the only scriptural baptism. However, he does not say that the sprinkling of infants is taught in the scriptures, though he endeavors to show that some of the objections offered to the practice are not valid. This may be true, and Jehovah may take great interest in the welfare of children, as you (Mr. D.) think the scripture that you quote proves. But will you point to one precept or example in all the book of God that unequivocally authorizes the baptism of infants? If not, what will you reply, if God should ask you, 'Who hath required this at your hands?' You profess to reject all creeds and confessions made by man—to disregard the authority of Synods and Conferences, and to take the word of God alone for the rule of your faith. All very good. You will be tried by it at the last day; and remember that you will not be tried by your speculations or theory about the word, but by the word itself: "The words that I have spoken, the same shall judge you at the last day," said Jesus.

But we intended to treat our readers to some things from this book, and not to read Mr. Duncan a lecture about his lectures. Mr. Duncan dissents from the views of Trinitarians, without fellowshipping those of Unitarians. He has an original, independent mind. He is neither afraid to think, nor express his thoughts. We have concluded to present to our readers a portion from his pen, on the subject of foreknowledge, thinking it is calculated to be useful:—

FOREKNOWLEDGE.

"All will say God is omniscient, and therefore knows whatever comes to pass. And what then? Whatsoever God foreknows will

certainly, it is supposed, come to pass, and is of course fixed and certain—foreordained and predestined. Foreknowledge and predestination are thus represented to be in fact the same thing; and we are often told that it is scarcely worth while to distinguish between them, seeing that either will lead infallibly to the same result. Nay, more, it has been said that nothing can be foreknown which has not been preordained: so that the divine decrees are the basis of the divine foreknowledge. Such it is imagined is the order of nature in the case. This reasoning will be applied to the subject we have in point, as follows: God foreknows who will ultimately be saved and who will not. This is necessarily implied in the fact that he foreknows all things that come to pass. In this matter God cannot be deceived. The precise number of those that are eventually to be saved, is therefore certainly fixed beyond the power of change; and it is a matter of small difference whether in respect of that number God be said to foreknow or foreordain it. Still further, as God cannot foreknow a thing to come to pass that is not preordained, that precise number is foreordained—those that are saved are elected, and those that are not saved are reprobated. I believe that I have stated the argument fairly. If any object to the statement, and instead of reprobating, would say that those that are lost are passed by, I answer that this passing by is either the consequence of a divine decree, or it is not. If it be the consequence of a decree, it is reprobation. If it be not the consequence of a decree, God has simply foreknown the thing and has predetermined nothing about it. Then foreknowledge and foreordination are not the same thing; and as foreknowledge is not foreordination in the one case, neither is it in the other; so that if there be no reprobation, there is by parity of reasoning no election.

I object to the whole argument, though it be thought by many to be unanswerable. The necessary connexion between foreknowledge and preordination which it supposes, is not called for by the philosophy of *mind*. We foreknow that the sun will rise to-morrow, and we cannot be deceived. It is true that the rising of the sun to-morrow is a predestined event; but though it be so, it certainly does not depend on our volitions. Here, then, is mind foreknowing an event which must take place, and yet without preordaining that event. So far from our predetermining that event, we merely foreknow it, while its occurrence depends on the volitions of another Being; and had we been ignorant of the plans and intentions of that other Being, we should have foreknown nothing about the matter.

We may shrewdly predict the results which shall occur in the history of an individual whose character, or conduct, or circumstances may have furnished us with premises with which to reason. We may foretell with unerring certainty, the downfall of an empire, or a revolution in a community, and yet the events which are so unerringly prophesied, have no dependence on our volitions. We may kindly use all our efforts to prevent those foreseen disasters; may feel the most pressing obligations so to act, and yet our influence be exerted in vain. The more intellectual or intelligent a man may be, the more familiar he may become with such painful calculations. Yet his power to anticipate and declare such things, though amounting almost to the impossibility of committing a mistake, argues no preordination on the

part of the individual whose prophetic vision has been so clear. In fact the Old Testament Prophets, as well as the New Testament Apostles, did thus distinctly and indubitably foretell events which occurred centuries after they had gone to sleep with their fathers; and others which to this hour are not fulfilled, yet their knowledge did not exhibit any power on their part to predestine what they had prophesied. All this is perfectly accordant with the philosophy of mind. For in all the cases specified intellectual beings simply declared what they had the power to perceive, without any power to preordain. The volitions of numberless other beings, and even of generations of beings, passed under their prophetic glance; and all that can be predicted of the intellectual phenomenon is, that great power of judgment has been evinced.

God knows all things. To him the darkness and the light are both alike. One day is with him as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. He understandeth all our thoughts afar off. Nor is there a word of our tongue which he does not know altogether. Give to a human being such power, and what will he not be able to foretell? What calculations can he not make? Where is any necessity he should constrain or control the volitions of beings whose hearts and ways are thus open before him? Could he not predict who would do evil? We repeat it, the philosophy of *mind* requires no such indispensable connexion between foreknowledge and preordination; and therefore the foreknowledge of God does by no means necessarily imply his foreordination.

To me it seems that the argument which has been framed bespeaks a higher degree of perfection in the Eternal than that which we combat. For certainly it requires more intellectual reach and a wider range of thoughts in an intelligent being to foreknow and foretell the instantaneous volitions—varied movements of millions of other beings—of *all* other beings, than to foreknow and foretell what his own volitions and movements shall be. The one implies omniscience, and the other does not. Beings who are free to think and free to act, belong to a higher order of intelligence than they do who have no freedom of volition; and it is always more difficult to read their character and fathom their purposes. A slave can never be compared with a freeman, as he never can possess half the intelligence nor evince half the intellectual force. The officer who can govern a slave population is, or may be, wholly incompetent to preside over a free community. Now a man, as a free agent, is altogether a different being from a man as not free, in respect of religion, as well as in regard of any thing else. In the latter case he may be charmed with a series of "carnal ordinances"—pictures and images, fasts and festivals, pomp and ceremony, are all that he delights in. But in the former case, he calls for thought and argument, which must become refined and profound as rapidly as he advances in intellectual growth. The nearer, therefore, that he approaches to that which his Creator intended he should become, the greater is the degree of mind which he calls into communion with himself, and the higher does the Creator rise in his view. So that the philosophy of mind not only supposes no necessary connexion between foreknowledge and foreordination, but absolutely breaks it up, inasmuch as it requires more mind to govern a man as a

free agent, and inasmuch as free agency improves and exalts man himself.

But again I remark, God foreknows what has never come to pass, and what therefore could not have been preordained. If this assertion can be made good, the argument we are combatting will be completely overthrown. Let us try. When Jehovah made man at first, he placed him in a probationary state; endowed with power to keep the law, and yet liable to fall. The constitution which the Lawgiver established had two sides; for it might be fulfilled, and one train of consequences would follow; or it might be broken, and another train of consequences would follow. Certainly Jehovah knows both sides of his constitution. This cannot be denied. The denial of such a plain common sense truth would be in a high degree irrational. If it should be denied, we have only to add, that the law was broken, and the appropriate consequences have followed; all of which was confessedly foreknown; and now the very object is to recover what has been lost, and to bring about the other—an operation which is in actual progress, and therefore the same ground must have been equally foreknown. Indeed from the first Jehovah declares himself to know both good and evil; nor could he threaten on the one hand, or promise on the other, that of which he knew nothing.

A similar state of things is described by the Psalmist, in which God actually *declares* what would have occurred had his people obeyed his commandments: "O that my people had hearkened unto me, and Israel had walked in my ways! I should soon have subdued their enemies and turned my hand against their adversaries. The haters of the Lord should have submitted unto him: but their time should have endured forever. He should have fed them also with the finest of the wheat; and with honey out of the rock should I have satisfied thee. But my people would not hearken to my voice; and Israel would none of me. So I gave them up to their own hearts' lust; and they walked in their own counsels." Here what came to pass and what did not come to pass, are both distinctly asserted.

One more example: "O Lord God of Israel," said David, "thy servant hath certainly heard that Saul seeketh to come to Keilah to destroy the city for my sake. Will the men of Keilah deliver me up into his hand? Will Saul come down as thy servant hath heard?"—The Lord replied that Saul would come down, and that the men of Keilah would deliver him into Saul's hands. Now the fact is, that Saul did not come down, neither did the men of Keilah deliver David into his hand; for David immediately made his escape. Here, then, God positively foreknew, and actually declared, what did not come to pass. The indispensable connexion between foreknowledge and predestination which has been so often asserted, is therefore a pure theological figment, destitute of all liberal thought, and as cramped as it is untrue.

But, perhaps, it may now be objected that my reasoning destroys predestination altogether. This objection would be inconsiderate. For such a being as I have supposed God to be, presiding over such a race of intelligent creatures as I have supposed men to be, must have his own views and designs, and would certainly predetermine to the extent of his own volitions and plans. No intelligent being can act

without some defined purposes and intentions. Neither would God so act. We may then expect to find, as a matter of course, "fixed points," established rules, and unavoidable events, displayed under his administration. He will carry out a line of moral causes and effects, as indispensable and certain as any laws in physical nature. He will create official trust, as seemeth good to him, in order to sustain his own government. He will bring about certain events—the crucifixion of his Son for example—as indispensable to the accomplishment of his own wise and gracious purposes. And all these may be foreknown and foreordained. But none of them infringe, nor is there any necessity that they should infringe in the least degree on the volitions of his creatures beyond their own proper responsibility.

From the whole it follows that there is nothing in God's foreknowledge or foreordination to interfere with the universality of the gospel. And we are left free to declare that *Christ died for all men;* that his gospel may be preached to all men; and that whosoever will, may believe and be saved."

REMARKS.

So have we been accustomed to reason on this sublime subject; and we are pleased to see one for whom we have so long cherished a very high respect, so able, so learned, and so elegant a writer, speak out so manfully and rationally in the face of vulgar prejudices and canonized opinions, sanctioned too by ancient and venerable prescription. While on this subject, and in reference to another point of view in which it is placed before the mind, we would add a remark or two.

It is argued that—The elect (i. e. the chosen and faithful followers of the Lamb) cannot so eloquently, so impassionedly, and so worthily celebrate the lofty praises of sovereign grace in the celestial and eternal world, unless they can see their entire personal redemption from sin and its prolific train of positive and endless evils to have sprung from a special predestination, and not from either the general or particular foreknowledge of God. To this we reply that—The saved are as great debtors to the grace of God upon the principle of foreknowledge as upon the principle of foreordination: for if in the clear, full, and perfect prescience of our heavenly Father, he saw that the saved, or those who obey the gospel call and command, would have been lost but for the gift of righteousness by Jesus Christ; and if he also saw that only a part of mankind would attain to eternal life, if for their sakes (and certainly it was for their sakes) he gave his richest gift, the life and death of his only begotten and well beloved Son, and his Holy Spirit, to dwell in them, foreknowing that only they would partake of the benefit—they are as great debtors to his grace as if they had been from all eternity most specially and particularly designated and foreordained to everlasting life.

It is, however, affirmed that certain persons were personally fore-

ordained as clearly and fully as the mission, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and in consequence of this eternal purpose only do they become partakers of the benefits of the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. Of this class were Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, David, Cyrus, Paul, &c. Grant it for the sake of argument. But for what purpose were they predestined? To personal salvation only or primarily? No: they were like the Messiah—as parts of a great remedial system, ordained as benefactors and saviours of men. So spake Jesus to Saul of Tarsus: "I have appeared to thee [in consequence of an eternal purpose, no doubt] to make thee a *minister*, and a *witness* of what you have seen;" or, as Ananias explains it, (Acts xxii.) "The God of our fathers has chosen you to know his will, and to see that righteous person, and to hear a voice from his mouth, *because* you shall be his witness to all men of those things which you have seen and heard." Not for personal salvation, but for public blessings were these distinguished persons predestined, called, and sanctified to God.

But the moderate Calvinist himself, more enlightened and dispassionate, neutralizes his own doctrine of election and reprobation by teaching, as many of them now do, that God's decrees stand in the way of no one who desires to be saved; for that every one who seeks may find—nay, every one that seeks with all his heart, will find salvation; for none are reprobated but those that God foresaw would reprobate salvation. True, indeed, this view shifts the foundation of their theory by making foreknowledge the basis of predestination, and not predestination the basis of foreknowledge. Better, however, to speak of Bible things in Bible words, and leave these curious questions to those who prefer being wise above what is written, to understanding and obeying what God has spoken. A. C.

FAITH ALONE.

When Paul speaks of justification by faith, does he use the term "*alone*"? And if he does not, where is the authority for saying we are justified by faith alone? Did not the Jews seek justification by the works, or deeds of the law?—and was it not the object of Paul, in his letters to the Romans and Galatians, to prove that no man, whether Jew or Gentile, could be justified by the law of Moses? Does he not use the case of Abraham to prove that position, because Abraham was justified before the giving of the law, and before he was circumcised? Was it not his object simply to show, that by the deeds of the law, faith apart, no flesh could be justified, because by the law is the knowledge of sin; and because Christ is the end of the law for righteousness, to every one that believeth? Does he not use the term *justification* as equivalent to pardon, or remission? And does, or does he not,

exclude "*the obedience of faith*," as a means, or condition of our justification before God? If he does not exclude "*the obedience of faith*," as a means of our justification, has brother Winans or father Campbell any right to preach "*faith alone*" in order to justification? And is not this ascribing justification to faith, in the abstract? And would this not conflict with St. James' sentiments? Now I look upon faith as a principle of action—as a principle of obedience; and I humbly conceive that we are justified by *the obedience of faith*, and not by faith in the abstract. I do not suppose that we are *justified by faith alone*, nor *by obedience alone*, but *by faith and obedience*, or *the obedience of faith*. This seems to be the doctrine taught by James. Paul's works, by which he says we are not justified, *are works of the law;* but James' works, by which he says we are justified, *are works of obedience*. There is no clashing between Paul and James, because they use the term *works* differently. Faith is a working principle.

Brother Campbell, let us hear from you on this subject.

PUBLIUS.

Lloyd's, Essex co., Va., August 21, 1840.

REMARKS.

Is it scriptural to say that a person is justified by *faith alone*? I answer, No. Neither Prophet nor Apostle has ever said that a sinner is pardoned by faith alone. Without repentance there is no pardon, and yet sinners are not pardoned by repentance alone; without faith there is no justification, and yet men are not justified by faith alone. *Sinners* are justified by grace, by blood, by faith, by knowledge; but not by any one of these alone. *Professors* are not justified by faith, by grace, by blood, by knowledge; but by works. Nor are they justified by works alone, only as *professors*. As *persons* they are justified by a living working faith.

Faith is indeed the principle, without which there is no justification, sanctification, adoption, salvation, or glorification; but it is a living, active, working principle. A dead faith never justified any person: "Thou seest how faith worked in Abraham, and by works his *faith was made perfect*." In this sense only is a man justified by faith; but not by faith alone.

"Faith alone" is an abstraction, and a man will as soon live animally on pure oxygen, as spiritually on pure faith. Yet as man cannot live without oxygen, so cannot he live without faith. It is the vital principle in the new man; for the just man by faith shall live.

James asks, "What is the advantage, my brethren, if any one say he have faith, but have not works—can faith *save him*?" And more remarkable still, *faith alone is dead faith*. Our brethren who talk of faith alone seem to have forgotten that we have *divine authority* for calling faith alone *dead* faith. Ask James the Apostle for a definition of dead faith, and he answers, 'A dead faith is faith alone.' His words

are, "*Faith without works is dead,*" Now what is faith alone but faith without works? "Would you," says James, "O vain man! know that [faith alone] faith without works is dead!" Unless, then, we are justified by a dead faith, we are **not** justified by faith alone.

Well, some one will say, James speaks of *professors*, not of *sinners*. Let it be granted; but what is his conclusion of the whole matter? He speaks of a *man*, and not of a *professor* only: for, in summing up the whole, he says, "You see that by works a *man* is justified, and not by faith alone.* He does not say, you see, that by works a professor or a believer, but a *man*, is justified, and not by faith only.

What shall we say then? Shall we say that a sinner is justified by the obedience or the effect of faith? No! but by faith living; that is, faith working, obeying. IT IS NOT BY FAITH ALONE, NOR BY WORKS ALONE, NOR BY FAITH AND WORKS TOGETHER; BUT BY FAITH WORKING THAT A SINNER IS JUSTIFIED. So I explain my views of this long-debated and with many still unsettled question. Faith is not *perfect* but by working. So James explains Abraham's faith when he was more than 120 years old; and so Paul explains his faith when he was 75 years old. "By faith," says Paul, "Abraham, when called, *obeyed*, and went out." Then his faith was counted to him for *righteousness*. But in the case of offering up Isaac his faith was demonstrated to be *perfect*. I conclude, then, that it is both unscriptural and unreasonable to talk of being justified by faith *alone*, that being equivalent to affirming that man is justified by a dead or an imperfect faith; and such is not the faith of God's elect. I presume farther than this neither father Campbell nor brother Winans intended to be understood.

A. C.

FAMILY CULTURE.

CONVERSATIONS AT THE CARLTON HOUSE.

No. XI.

Olympas. BEFORE reading the 10th chapter of Genesis this morning, I ask the family by what authority is it said that Noah was a hundred and twenty years in building the ark?

William. The Lord said man's days should be a hundred and twenty years when he repented that he had made him, and immediately gave orders for building the ark. Now we presume that Noah was obedient to the heavenly precept, and soon commenced.

* Read 2d chapter, 14th verse to the end.

Olympas. But a gentleman who heard our conversation on Gen. vi, has observed that the birth of Shem, Ham, and Japheth was announced before the order to build the ark. And as Shem was only 98 years old when the flood commenced, the ark could not have been a hundred and twenty years in building. How do you dispose of this difficulty?

William. I never thought of that before?

Olympas. How do you dispose of it, Reuben?

Reuben. It does not lie in my way: for I have had my doubts about the time the ark was a-building. I think that in one hundred and twenty years some parts of it would have been worm-eaten, and consequently unsafe.

Olympas. What, Thomas, do you say to this difficulty?

Thomas. The fact that the sons of Noah are mentioned before the order to build the ark, does not prove that they were born before that order. Historians sometimes anticipate themselves. Thus Moses gives an account of the generation of the heavens and the earth, and afterwards the formation of the earth. But the reason why I have supposed that the ark was a hundred and twenty years in building, is from the words of Peter. In his first epistle he says the long-suffering of God waited while the ark was preparing. Now as he measures the long-suffering by the time of building the ark, or the building of the ark by the long-suffering, we are authorized to say, that as the long-suffering is affirmed to have been a hundred and twenty years, the ark was that time in being builded. Besides, I see all our chronologists date the order for building the ark with the promise of 120 years forbearance.

Olympas. So I reason. It is probable, however, that Noah consumed several years in the preparations for that stupendous superstructure. It is not unreasonable to suppose that half the time was spent in getting out and seasoning the materials, &c.

Thomas. There are some points in the 9th chapter which were referred, not yet attended to—Noah's drunkenness and the irreverence of Ham, with the curse on Canaan.

Olympas. True, these points were not considered in our last lesson. Well, then, what think you, James, was the employment of Noah? You remember Adam was a gardener, Cain a farmer, and Abel a shepherd. How did the new world begin?

James. Noah began to be a husbandman, or farmer, and planted a vineyard.

Olympas. This was a new pursuit. The cultivation of the vine is, however, sanctioned by authority very ancient and very hi h. But was it not a snare to Noah, Eliza?

Eliza. Noah drank to excess, and was drunken.

Olympas. You must not judge too hastily about this affair. Noah in all probability was ignorant of the power of the juice of the grape. And no one can lawfully infer that this ever occurred before or after in the life of this good and excellent man, the father and saviour of the present world. The innocence of Noah in this accident is fully proved from the fact that he was gifted with the spirit of prophecy immediately on awaking from this sleep of wine. He foresaw in a glance of his eye the future destinies of his sons. Who of the three sons dishonored his father, William?

William. Ham, the father of Canaan. Why Canaan was cursed for this deed of his father I cannot say; but it would seem as if the curse fell on him.

Olympas. It fell not upon him specially, but upon his descendants. Still, as in the family of Adam and Abraham, the behaviour of the father yet affects the offspring, the curse upon Canaan (probably a participant with his father) has descended to many generations.—Children are *temporally* involved in all the fortunes of their parents. If eternally, it is because of something of their own superadded. The curse on Canaan, or on this branch of Noah's family, is that of servitude in this world. It reaches no farther. But the descendants of Ham, in some branches of his family, especially in the line of Canaan and Cush, have been the veriest slaves to Shem and Japheth. What means the name *Ham*, Reuben?

Reuben. You taught us that Ham signifies *burnt*, or *black*. The Cushites, the eldest branch of Ham's family, dwelt in the hottest part of Asia, and from them it is believed that the Ethiopians descended. Egypt also was formerly known as the land of Ham.

Olympas. How long after the delivery of this prophecy was it before the Canaanites served the sons of Shem?

Thomas. Thirty Canaanitish kings were subdued by Joshua, who made the Gibeonites and others servants of the Israelites some eight hundred years after this time. The Greeks and the Romans, sons too of Japheth, subdued the Tyrians and Carthaginians, whose offspring have served both the Saracens and the Turks.

Olympas. Some have justified servitude from the fact that it came from the Lord—was foretold and ordained of Heaven. What think you, Reuben—how would you reason this point?

Reuben. The Lord's foretelling an event does not authorize any one to bring it about; for then Judas would have been innocent in betraying the Lord. If, then, the Lord, foreseeing the future fortunes of Canaan, did not interpose to prevent them, but intending to permit

them, foretold their occurrence, no person is warranted or allowed to inflict any evil upon them.

Olympas. So the scriptures and right reason teach us. The Lord gives over to their enemies them that have forsaken him, and yet he will punish them that have afflicted them. But a more accurate attention to the distribution of the three branches of Noah's family will assist us in tracing the fortunes of this people. Let us read the 10th chapter of the book of Genesis, the most valuable piece of ancient history in the world.

[The chapter being read, the conversation is resumed.]

Olympas. With which of the three sons does the historian commence when about to show the location of their descendants?

Susan. With Japheth?

Olympas. Why?

Susan. Because it is most comely to begin with the eldest, and Japheth was older than either Shem or Ham.

Olympas. How many sons had Japheth, James?

Susan. Seven, viz.—Gomer, Magog, Madai, Javan, Tubal, Meshech and Tiras. And of their sons how many, William, are named?

William. Seven also—only, however, the sons of Gomer and of Javan.

Olympas. In profane history tell us, Thomas, who corresponds in name with Japheth?

Thomas. The ancient Greeks generally, I believe, call Japheth by the name of *Japetus.*

Olympas. So historians generally concur. The Greeks are therefore sprung from Japheth: the Germans, from Gomer; the Scythians and Tartars, from Magog; the Medes, from Madai; the Ionians, from Javan; the Iberians, from Tubal; the Muscovites, from Meshech; and the Thracians, from Tiras. What countries were settled with them, Thomas?

Thomas. Europe generally, with the northern extremes of Asia.

Olympas. By these seven sons, and the seven sons of Japheth, were "the isles of the Gentiles divided in their lands;" all Europe and the northern parts of Asia Minor, and most probably some parts of ancient America were of the posterity of Japheth. God, then, has fulfilled his promise to Japheth. He said he would enlarge Japheth—indeed, the word *Japheth* signifies *enlargement.* How many sons of Ham are named, Eliza?

Eliza. Only four, viz.—Cush and Mizraim, Phut and Canaan.

Olympas. How many grand-sons, William?

William. Twenty-four are named, besides other descendants.

Olympas. From these that are named nations arose, whose countries are sometimes called after them. What countries were settled by the four sons of Ham?

Thomas. Part of Arabia and Ethiopia was settled by Cush; Egypt, by Mizraim; Lybia, by Phut; and the Promised Land, by Canaan.

Olympas. Amongst the descendants of the third and fourth generations of Ham there are some very renowned names, Reuben.

Reuben. Yes, sir—Nimrod, Ashur, and Philistim.

Olympas. What great cities were founded by these, Eliza?

Eliza. Babel, Enoch, Accad, Nineveh, Rehoboth, and Calah.

Olympas. Two of these, Babel and Nineveh, are of great renown; and, indeed, the names of the sons of Ham are inscribed on many countries—Egypt was formerly called Mizraim; and Seba, Havilah, Sheba, Lybia, Philistina, Sidon, &c. unequivocally declare their origin.

William. Have we not a proof that events are antedated in the narrative, or that the order of narration is not always the order of events, in the 6th and 20th verses of this chapter.

Olympas. Wherein, William?

William. We are told in the 5th verse that the Isles of the Gentiles were settled by the sons of Japheth *according to their language;* and yet there was but one language in the world: for in the first verse of the next chapter we are told the whole earth was of one language and of one speech!

Olympas. William, I believe you are right; and in the 20th verse also of the 10th chapter we are informed, as you say, that the sons of Ham according to their tongues settled certain countries—those of one tongue going together.

William. Was I not justified, then, in saying that the ark was one hundred and twenty years in building; for the mentioning of the birth of Shem, Ham, and Japheth before the narrative of the order to build the ark, no more proves that they were born before the order, than that there were many tongues in the earth before the building of Babel, because we are informed of many languages before we are informed of the building of the tower which occasioned the cleft tongues.

Olympas. I think, William, you are triumphant in this potent fact against all the world, should they attempt to prove either the order of Christian worship or any other events, merely from the uniformity of historians in narrating things in the order of occurrence. But to keep to our lesson: tell me, James, how many sons had Shem?

James. Five, sir—Elam, Ashur, Arphaxad, Lud, and Aram.

Olympas. What countries, Eliza, think you are denoted by those five chiefs of the Shemites?

Eliza. Elam was the ancient name of Persia; Asshur, of Assyria; Arphaxad, of *Artarcata*, first called Arrapacha, in Armenia; Lud gives Lydia, in Asia Minor, and Aram gives the Aramians, afterwards called Syrians.

Olympas. Very true. We have, then, the Persians, Assyrians, Arminians, Lydians, and Syrians, deriving their names and origin from the five sons of Shem. And what, Sarah, can you tell about the grand sons of Shem?

Sarah. I read of Uz, Hul, Gether, Mash, Salah, and Eber, Peleg and Joktan.

Olympas. Yes, my daughter; but Eber was the great grand son of Shem, and Peleg and Joktan were the great great grand sons.

Sarah. I think if they were so far off, they should be called the little grand son and the little little grand sons of Shem.

Olympas. Well, Custom says great great grand father and great grand son, and we cannot change it now; but *great* applied to ancestors and *little* to descendants, might perhaps have done as well.

Thomas. Were the Hebrews so called from Eber their father?

Olympas. What do you say, William?

William. I think they were, if Eber was one of their progenitors; but I cannot learn that he was from this chapter; for we have only the descendants of one of his sons, Joktan, and not those of Peleg.

Olympas. In other chapters we are informed that *Eber* was an ancestor of Abraham; still it is not certain that they were called Hebrews from Eber. *Aber*, or, according to other orthoepists, *Eber*, signifies *passing over;* and because Abraham passed over the Euphrates on his way to Canaan, some learned men with more plausibility argue that they were called Hebrews, or Pilgrims, from their passing over the Euphrates, and because for a long time they had no country of their own. I incline to this opinion. They confessed, said Paul, that they were pilgrims (i. e. Hebrews) in the land of promise. By dwelling in tents in their own land, they lived as foreigners or as persons on a journey. So ought Christians to live as pilgrims here.

Edward and Henry, as you have been sick for some days, I have not interrogated you, not having had time to prepare your lessons by previous study; but now that you have heard the last two lessons, I must see what attention you have bestowed on our examination. Tell me, then, Henry, how you would compute the relative population of the three branches of Noah's family from all you have heard.

Henry. Do you mean their present population, or their population at any given time?

Olympas. I mean their population in all time since the first settlement of their families; for we calculate upon this principle, that the drawbacks from climate, soil, wars, pestilences, famines, &c. are equal or nearly so.

Henry. I would count all their descendants mentioned by Moses at the time of their settlement, and making the aggregate amount the denominator, and the descendants of each the numerator, I would thus display their relative numbers now.

Olympas. And how, Edward, would you go to work to solve this problem?

Edward. I would not take all the descendants mentioned by Moses, because he gives more generations of one than of another. Now had he given the same number of generations of them all, Henry's rule would be correct. I would, therefore, take the sons, and leave the other descendants.

Olympas. Edward, you are right; but Henry's principle and yours are the same—you only differ in the application of it. Well, Henry gives your denominator and your three numerators.

Henry. Japheth, the *maximus natu*, the oldest, had *seven* sons; Ham, the *senior*, the second born, had only *four* sons; and Shem, the *minimus natu*, or the youngest, had *five* sons. Now add all their sons for a denominator, and we have sixteen in all. Then the relative data are, Japheth has seven-sixteenths of the human race; Ham, four-sixteenths; and Shem, five-sixteenths.

Olympas. Very good, Henry. You suppose the same ratio of daughters as sons, and that is reasonable. But is not a difference of one in the starting a great deal in a thousand years—more than the mere relative value at the beginning?

Edward. No: the relative number is still the same. For example: Suppose that they all had exactly the same number of grand sons—that is to say, four each; then Japheth's grand sons would be twenty-eight; Ham's, sixteen; Shem's, twenty. The denominator would then be sixty-four, and Japheth would have twenty-eight sixty-fourths—that is just equal to seven-sixteenths; Ham would have sixteen sixty-fourths, that is just four-sixteenths; and Shem twenty sixty-fourths, that is five-sixteenths.

Olympas. You have carried your point. We may safely conclude, then, that in all probability while only one-fourth of the human race have sprung from Ham, and a little more than a third from Shem, nearly one half are sprung from Japheth. But, Thomas, what does all this prove?

Thomas. It all proves that Japheth received his name by prophesy,

and that Noah spake by the Spirit when he said, "God shall *enlarge* Japheth." His name is ENLARGEMENT.

Olympas. Make room for Japheth! God gave him a large estate—the north of Asia, all Europe, and the most of America. But better still, "He shall dwell in the tents of Shem." What of this, my sons?

[All silent.]

William. It is difficult—because, 1st. "*He*" may refer to God or to Japheth. Then it would be, '*God* shall dwell in the tents of Shem.'

O. This was true: but still, altho' it might be so answered, I prefer to read, 'And he, *Japheth*, shall dwell in the tents of Shem.' This denotes not only what has often happened, viz.—that the sons of Japheth in the persons of the Scythians, Greeks, Romans, Tartars, Britons, &c., have taken the lands and houses of the sons of Shem, but that his descendants should partake of the blessings of the Lord God of Shem, and be made one body with them under Christ. But our time is drawing to a close, and it is whispered into my ears that an important point in the 9th chapter has been passed over. But we cannot finish these things perfectly in one or two courses: we must leave something for the next time. But before we conclude this lesson, Edward, tell me what countries were possessed and are still possessed by the sons of Shem?

Edward. Japheth, as before stated, peopled all Europe, Lesser and Northern Asia, and there being but forty miles or less, bridged too by islands, between the northern ends of Asia and America, it is most probable that the northern hive of Asia sent some swarms across the island of Behring into this vast country, and so the sons of Japheth are American, European, and Asiatic.

Shem filled the upper and central Asia, Armenia, Mesopotamia, Assyria, Media, Persia, and the countries reaching to the ancient Ganges and the Indus; while Ham got the hot regions in the south of Asia and Africa, Egypt and Philistina, Lybia, Sidon, Tyre, Carthage, and some of the islands of the Southern Ocean.

Olympas Any thing to say about the colors of these families?

Henry. The lessons you gave us on the colors of the human race I do not fully remember; but this much I recall, that Asia is yellow; America, red; Africa, black; and Europe, white.

Olympas. True: as these lands approach each other they mingle their colors or shade sinks or rises into shade, till we have the white, the yellow, the red, and the black. But the moral of this lesson, and we will file something for to-morrow. What is the moral, Thomas?

Thomas. As respects the whole affair of the division of the earth amongst these three sons, and their respective families, the facts are

first to be considered. Shem had the most honorable family, and the richest and best patrimony. All the Prophets, Apostles, and lights of the world, together with Emanuel himself, belonged to Shem. Japheth had the largest posterity and the most extensive land and sea estate; together with the fairest, hardiest, and most enterprizing people: while Ham has the fewest people, only one-fourth; Shem and Japheth having full three-fourths of the human race. His patrimony was small, his color dark, his talents few and feeble, and his rank inferior to that of his brothers. The cause was, *he dishonored his father.*

Olympas. What a lesson! What a moral! May the Lord lead you all to honor your father and your mother, which is the first command with promise! A. C.

APPEALS.

IS THERE NO APPEAL FROM THE DECISION OF A SINGLE CONGREGATION?

If there be not, then indeed it is not only supreme, but ought to be infallible. But no single community professes infallibility. Then no single congregation ought to demand for its decisions absolute and unconditional acquiescence in all cases. Some of the independents, however, have applied the words "if he will not *hear the church*" to the voice of a single community, and have excluded forever from their communion, and from the communion of the whole church, such persons as would not unconditionally yield to their decision.

Complaints and questions on this subject are on our files, and some excellent brethren have been excluded from congregations either through ignorance or prejudice, in which they can neither obtain a hearing nor a place, but upon condition of acquiescence with the decisions of the church in their own case; for the church claims to be the only supreme and infallible court of Christ on earth. To illustrate what I mean I will state an instance which has recently occurred in a church in Baltimore:—

BALTIMORE, August 25, 1840.

Dear brother Campbell,

In the effort made by the professed disciples of the Redeemer throughout this country for a return to the primitive doctrine, order, and purity of the Christian religion, it is a truth of general notoriety that no congregation has been exposed to greater afflictions than the one in Baltimore. To enumerate and specify their trials is not now our object; but knowing the great interest you have ever felt and manifested in this common cause, we feel justified in giving you an account of some recent events, which, in our judgment, form an important crisis in the history of our affairs, and call for the advice, aid, and co-operation of disinterested and intelligent brethren. Seeing with deep regret and sorrow

of heart the sad consequences resulting from the long continued schisms existing among us, and the cause threatened with still further disgrace by an open rupture through the medium of a law-suit instituted against us by a few leading, yet misguided men, not that we feared the consequences of that suit so far as the mere question of property was concerned, there was to our minds another and greatly more important consequence to result from such procedure on the part of those professing the same faith and exhibiting the same order—we looked upon it as death to that cause which had already been well nigh crucified among us. With such fears and feelings, the brethren occupying the meeting house resolved to make another effort to reconcile the two bodies, and by the aid of a very able and intelligent brother from New York, (James Farquharson,) our effort, though at the expense of great personal sacrifice, was, as we had every reason to believe, greatly successful. In evidence of this you received assurances from both sides, of the happy termination of all our troubles. The undersigned have no hesitation in saying that they rejoiced with exceeding joy at the prospect of a final and triumphant deliverance from all our troubles, and that having learned from experience the bitter consequences of contention and strife, we should once more set down together in the fear and love of God and each other, uniting our efforts for mutual instruction, edification, and comfort, and in showing forth the word of the Lord to our dying fellow-men. In this anticipation, however, we have been most grievously and mournfully disappointed. A very few weeks after this union had taken place some things took place which could not but have an injurious tendency. The principle or practice of disputation also between brethren in their teaching in the congregation was again introduced and contended for—the very rock on which the church had formerly split—and, in the opinion of the undersigned, is one of the most ruinous and destructive practices ever introduced into any congregation where liberty of speech is allowed. Seeing the evil which threatened the cause from this most destructive practice, the undersigned entreated, expostulated, and besought, by every consideration in their power, to have this wretched practice excluded from the such; but, as the sequel will show, without success. Thus the matter stood when another mode of procedure was adopted differing from any thing which has ever come under our observation. The strange and unaccountable action of those persons is the chief object we have in view in this communication, under the full persuasion that such conduct cannot be countenanced or approved by any sensible and conscientious man. The undersigned have all been excluded from the church under the following circumstances: On Lord's day morning, August 2d, 1840, brother F. D. Dungan being in Boston or its vicinity, where he had been for some time previous on business; brother G. W. Morling in the country with his family; brother E. N. Sweeny and G. Austen filling a preaching appointment made for them about 20 miles from the city; all of us being thus absent from home, and without any knowledge of their intention, were arraigned, tried, and excluded wholly without our knowledge, and of course without the slightest opportunity of defence. The charge against us, we have since understood, was that of being factionists; and the only evidence (if such it might be called) by which it could be sustained, was, that in a meeting called by the Elders for the purpose of considering the matter, we earnestly urged upon the brethren the necessity of putting a stop to the disorderly practice of reply and abusive speaking in the congregation, supposing, as we did, that it might be made apparent that whatever did not tend to instruction, edification, or scriptural holiness, ought not to be tolerated among us. If this body is to be regarded as a church of Christ, we of necessity must be looked upon as excluded members. How will the brethren decide this question? * * * * * * * * * * * * *

E. A SWEENY, G. W. MORLING,
FRANCIS D. DUNGAN, GEORGE AUSTEN.

In such cases what shall the brethren do? This is the question. I know these brethren personally: they are not only persons of excellent morals, and of as much intelligence, to say the least, as the majority

of those they left behind them. Without, then, inquiring into the reasons of this exclusion, whether in any sense justifiable, or in every sense unjustifiable, (for that is not our province,) I institute the query, Are these brethren now left to the alternative of either living as excommunicated persons, or of acquiescing in this decision and confessing, contrary to their conscience and understanding, that they were worthy of such treatment and are penitent for their sins?

I answer, No. The community that excluded them is itself amenable to the church, the whole church of God, of which in their best estate they are but a part. And these brethren making their appeal to a disinterested community or communities, promising submission to their decisions, must, on every principle of New Testament justice and apostolic principle, have a hearing. The eldership, or a committee of two or three neighboring churches, meeting on the case, the injured promising submission to their decision, must finally decide who are right and wrong. The case is so reasonable in itself, and so fully sustained by the appeal of the Antiochan brethren to the church of Jerusalem, that I feel no necessity of farther arguing the question, than showing the fact of a reference from the Antiochan to the Jerusalem church.

The facts are the following:—Certain Christian Jews visited Antioch, teaching heretical tenets. Paul and Barnabas withstood them; but unsatisfactorily to the community in Antioch. The brethren, with Paul and Barnabas at their head, and with all their prophets and teachers, resolved to refer these disturbing questions to the church in Jerusalem. They did so, and deputed messengers, amongst whom Paul and Barnabas were numbered. The church in Jerusalem *received* them in the character of their mission, and called a special meeting to consider the questions referred. The whole church, with the Apostles and Elders, convened; and the matter was discussed by the wise men among them. They decided the questions referred, and deputed their own messengers, in company with those of Syria, to bear their decision to Antioch; and so the matters were finally settled and acquiescence secured.

Now the only fact in this case which we claim at present is, that one of the primitive churches, sanctioned by the Apostles, referred to another that which it could not satisfactorily settle itself. From which the following inferences are deemed just and necessary:—

1. That no community called *a* church is absolutely independent of *the* church of God, but amenable to the whole church for its administration of its affairs.

2. That when a church has any matter on hand which involves the

peace and prosperity of other communities, it is incumbent on it to wait the decision of one or more disinterested communities.

That every community is independent in managing its own peculiar affairs, has always been our judgment; but that in any matter affecting the conscience, or character, or prosperity of other communities, no community can scripturally, prudentially, or justly decide any question in disregard of the views, feelings, and judgment of other communities. Nor can a majority oppress a weak minority without the right of appeal from its decisions. The brethren in the case before us, on refusal of a hearing from the party that excluded them, have, on all principles of justice, a right to appeal to any other community or communities agreed upon by both; and on refusal of such a reference, the church refusing cuts herself off from the communion of all other churches of Christ, and the party oppressed by such usurpation have a right, without the concurrence of such society, to appeal to any other congregation for a hearing, and to stand or fall by its decision. Such is my judgment on all the premises before me. But to argue it out farther at present is not convenient. A. C.

ADMINISTRATION OF ORDINANCES.

THE following judicious and excellent remarks are from the pen of our Baptist brother *Andrew Broaddus*, in reply to some questions which must be inferred from the answers given. They appeared in the Religious Herald, for January, 1835; and besides their intrinsic value, we copy them to show that views called heterodox when in our hands, become orthodox when presented through the hands of one so deservedly popular among the Virginia Baptists as our much respected and esteemed friend Broaddus. A. C.

I could wish the circumstances of the case had been stated by *Xenoi*, a little more explicitly; as I think it might thus be treated in a more definite and satisfactory manner, than by answer to the queries which are subjoined.

Your applicants, it seems, have been baptized, and solemnly immersed, upon a conviction of the scriptural requisition, and their consequent duty and privilege, as believers in Jesus Christ. But in accomplishing this object, there was, as I understand the matter, *some irregularity*. And this irregularity, I take it for granted, was, *namely:* that the series of baptisms was commenced by an unbaptized individual; for so the statement seems to imply. It says, that "after much serious consultation and fervent prayer, it was unanimously resolved that ———, one of the Elders, being immersed, the work should go on," &c. And the apology for this irregularity appears to be the

non-existence of any Baptist church, of scriptural faith, "within their knowledge or reach." Thus, as I apprehend it, stands the case; and the question arising out of it is, Can these persons be considered as baptized with a valid baptism, and received accordingly? This, it must be admitted, is an important matter, and one not to be settled at a single stroke. It presents one of those difficulties which irregularity is apt to involve; yet it requires to be settled, and in the best manner that circumstances will admit.

Let us inquire, Can any degree of irregularity be admitted, in the performance of those divine ordinances, called *positive institutions*, without destroying the validity of the performance?

Any deviation from the original plan—the divine model, must be allowed in such a case, to be dangerous: and I should say, that as positive institutions possess in themselves no intrinsic virtue, but derive their worth from the authority and command of the instituter, a change in the *form* or the *subject* of the institution must subvert the ordinance, and render the performance nugatory. To which I may add, that the same effect would follow, where the action, on the part of the administrator or the subject, should appear to have been performed in the *spirit of mockery*, or without regard to the solemnity of the object.

Take, for instance, as it regards *form* and *subject*, the ordinance of baptism—a positive institute. Christ says, "He that *believeth* and is baptized," &c. If you take one who is confessedly an unbeliever, or one incapable of faith, while Christ gives no such authority, you do, by changing the subject, radically change the ordinance, and destroy the validity of the performance. Further, Christ says, "*baptizing* them," &c. i. e. immersing them. If you sprinkle or pour a little water on the subject, you change the *form;* and the form is here the *thing itself;* and so again you radically change the ordinance: it is not baptism: you might as well attempt to prove that a *triangle* is a *circle.*

Again—take, for instance, as it regards the *spirit* in which the action appears to be performed, the ordinance of the Lord's supper. The Corinthians, (or many of them,) celebrated this solemnity in an irreverent manner; and the Apostle tells them, "This is not to eat the Lord's supper." They perverted the great object of the institution, and rendered the performance worse than nugatory.

But the question recurs: Can any degree of irregularity be admitted in the performance of a positive institution, without destroying the validity of the performance? I would now answer, that in some cases the *subject*, the *form*, and the *solemnity of the object* being all observed, some degree of irregularity may be excused. If, indeed, the plain expressed will of Christ cannot be complied with, I would have no substitute; he does not require impossibilities; and to put a thing of human invention, in any case whatever, in the place of a positive institute, is a gratuitous offering which he will reject. But if the irregularity consist in mere *circumstances*, not radically affecting the ordinance itself, it may, according to my view, be excused, and the performance be deemed valid—the difficulty of the case being considered as an apology for the want of a more regular observance of circumstances.

Now, in the particular case before us: The plea of difficulty here urged, I take it for granted, is a reasonable one; and the irregularity, as before presumed, consists in the commencement of the series of baptisms by an unbaptized—perhaps an unordained individual. But it was all done upon solemn conviction of divine requirement—upon profession of evangelical faith; and in due form, according to Christ's expressed will as to the action. Does the apparent defect in the circumstances here stated, invalidate the baptism? I am persuaded IT DOES NOT.

I will not plead as a precedent the case of the baptism of Roger Williams, and his congregation (in Rhode Island,) from whom many of the Baptists of this country have sprung—if that was wrong, it cannot make this right. Nor am I disposed to deny that baptizers in the Apostles' days, were all baptized persons; (though by the way, the first baptizer was not so;) but this is to be admitted rather as a matter of course,—all believers being then baptized straightway;—that is, where it could be done. It *ought* to be so now; and in that case there would probably have been here no difficulty. The baptizer who commenced this operation *ought* himself to have been baptized before this period; but it does not follow, that because he was baptized, and now perhaps could not be, that therefore he *ought not*, under existing circumstances, to have engaged in this work. George Whitefield (who was a Pedobaptist, and never baptized) *ought* to have been baptized before he went forth to preach; he might have been, too, if he would; and yet I should be loath to say that George Whitefield, though he *ought* to have been baptized, *ought not* to have preached at all, unless he had been baptized. And so of many others.

The baptizer ought himself to be previously baptized. This is readily admitted; and though for any thing that appears to the contrary, the obligation lies on him rather in the character of a *believer*, than in that of an *administrator*, I would be far from sanctioning the practice of baptizing by an unbaptized administrator, where the nature of the case does not render it necessary. The conduct of some Pedobaptists, both on the part of the administrator and the subject, presents an anomaly which can neither be justified nor excused: the subject submitting to be immersed by an unbaptized administrator, who has no faith in the act!

With regard to any defect on the score of *ordination*, I would say, it does not appear clear to me that the validity of baptism depends, under any circumstances, upon what we term ordination; I mean, ordination to the office of Bishop or Evangelist. That the Lord's supper *may be* duly celebrated without the presence of such a minister, I have no question: and I am much disposed to think that we should contravene no authority, by appointing a deacon, or any other grave and godly member of the church, to the work of baptizing.

If the case of your applicants is embraced in these remarks, it seems to me unnecessary to go into a discussion of the queries subjoined to the statement of Xenoi. If, however, there should be any thing in any of those queries involving the case, and not herein satisfactorily noticed, I would willingly, upon its being pointed out, lend my aid, as far as I am able, towards a solution of the difficulty.

These remarks, in which I have aimed at much plainness and simplicity, are affectionately submitted to the attention of all concerned,

with an earnest wish that as far as consistent with divine truth, the Head of the church may attend them with his blessing.

ANDREW BROADDUS.

REMARKS.

Here are three points admitted and justified by our brother Broaddus—(*brother* I have said, for a man cannot help being a brother sometimes whether or no)—for which we have suffered many reproaches by many of our Baptist brethren in days that are past: first, that a layman may baptize in some cases. 2d. That a layman's administration of the supper is scriptural. 3. That the appointment of "a deacon, or any other grave and godly member of a church, to baptize," is sanctioned by the Christian institution.

Little men in office are great officers. They have much to say about official duty and official power. Great men in office lay much less stress upon the office than upon the qualifications necessary to the discharge of its duties. They regard the duties above the office, and the office for qualifying them for discharging its duties, rather than as imparting any virtue to their acts. Official grace and official virtue are the very essence of popery. I think, however, that as a general rule, it is expedient and necessary to obtain an acceptable and dignified discharge of certain duties and the edifying observance of all Christian ordinances, that persons of intelligence, discretion, and gravity be appointed to attend to them. My experience certainly authorizes this conclusion; and the appointment of certain qualified persons for certain offices is as much a dictate of common sense as of the oracles of God.

Intelligent and pious Baptist preachers are every where yielding something to the increased and increasing intelligence of the age; and the day is not far distant, I confidently hope, when all the points advocated by us of this reformation will be universally admitted by the whole Baptist community. I am indeed of opinion that if the leading, intelligent, and pious persons in that community were to have a friendly conference upon the whole premises, they would, at least, rescind their Orders in Council, and advocate a free intercommunication between their churches and ours. I was pleased to hear the other day that the brethren in Eastern Virginia had occasionally invited Elder Broaddus to address them in their meetings, and that he has occasionally so waited upon them; and also, that some of the Baptist brethren, without reprehension, have communed with our brethren, old decrees and proscriptions to the contrary notwithstanding. I have no doubt but as these occurrences multiply, a better understanding, better feelings, and a more pacific and prosperous state of things will succeed the present.

A. C.

BETHANY COLLEGE.

THAT our friends and the public may know that our scheme of a great literary and moral institution for the proper training of youth in harmony with human nature and the whole destiny of man, is not sleeping on the shelf; and that the Lord being our helper, we are determined to prosecute the undertaking with a zeal and an enterprise in the ratio of the magnitude of the object—we lay before our readers the proceedings of the Board of the College at their two first meetings. The whole of our proceedings, so far as interesting to the community, together with the subscriptions received and the sums collected, shall be from time to time published in the Harbinger. We are making no exertions as yet to raise the necessary funds. The times being so unpropitious, and the political excitement so high, we are resolved not to commence these efforts until the political horizon becomes more clear, calm, and tranquil; which most devoutly to be wished for event we expect to commence after the storms of November shall have purified the atmosphere, and the presidential election shall have ended this unprecedented campaign.

Proceedings of the Board of Trustees of Bethany College.

The first meeting of the Board of Trustees of Bethany College was held at Bethany in pursuance of the Charter of the Institution, on Monday, May 11th, 1840. Trustees present—Thomas Campbell, Alexander Campbell, Robert Richardson, Robert Y. Henly, Matthew M'Keever, Samuel Grafton, John C. Campbell, William Stewart, and Robert Nicholls.

On motion of John C. Campbell, *Thomas Campbell* was unanimously called to the Chair.

On motion of William Stewart, *William F. M. Arny* was appointed Secretary of the Board of Trustees.

On motion of Samuel Grafton, *Alexander Campbell* was appointed Treasurer of Bethany College; also, as General Agent to procure donations, and to publish an Expose of the contemplated character of the Institution.

On motion of John C. Campbell, *William Stewart, Robert Richardson, Matthew M'Keever*, and *Alexander Campbell*, were appointed a Building Committee, who shall have power to procure and adopt a plan agreeably to which the necessary buildings shall be erected; also, to procure, when sufficient funds are collected for the purpose, the necessary materials for said buildings.

Ordered, That the annual meeting of the Board of Trustees shall be held on the second Monday in May.

Ordered, That the Treasurer shall file with the Secretary of this Board, before its next meeting, his bond, in the penalty of *ten thousand dollars*, with good security, conditioned for the proper performance of his office.

Ordered, That when this meeting adjourn, it adjourn to meet on Friday, the 18th day of Septemher next, at 12 o'clock A. M., at Bethany.

On motion of Samuel Grafton, the meeting was adjourned.

THOMAS CAMPBELL,
President pro tem

W. F. M. ARNY, *Secretary*.

A meeting of the Board of Trustees of Bethany College was held at Bethany, on Friday, September 18th, according to adjournment. Trustees present, Thomas Campbell, Alexander Campbell, Robert Richardson, Robert Y. Healey, Matthew M'Keever, Samuel Grafton, John C. Campbell, William Stewart, Robert Nicholls, Albert G. Ewing, and Adamson Bentley.

On motion of John C. Campbell, *Thomas Campbell* was unanimously called to the Chair.

After which the Secretary presented the Bond of the Treasurer, which was ordered to be filed.

Thereupon the Treasurer made a Report of what had been done by him since the last meeting, which was ordered to be filed.

After which Alexander Campbell presented a Bond for a Deed of ten acres of land for the use and benefit of Bethany College, which was received and ordered to be filed.

On motion of John C. Campbell, it was

Unanimously resolved, That the Building Committee be authorized to erect such buildings as they may deem necessary, according to the plan adopted; also, to procure permanent furniture, including beds and bedding, for the building now in progress of erection.

On motion of William Stewart, it was

Unanimously resolved, That the Board now proceed to the election of President of the College.

Whereupon *Alexander Campbell* was unanimously elected.

On motion of Albert G. Ewing, it was

Unanimously resolved, That the President be requested to prepare and submit to the next meeting of this Board for their action, a scheme of the course of education which he thinks ought to be adopted in this Institution; showing the number of Professors requisite under such system, and the branches to be taught by each respectively. Also, that he make inquiry for such Professors, Stewards, and Officers as he may deem necessary to be employed, and report to the next meeting of the Board the names of such persons as he would recommend for the various offices.

On motion of Adamson Bentley, it was

Unanimously resolved, That eight additional Trustees be now appointed:

When, on motion of Alexander Campbell, it was

Unanimously resolved, That Reuben L. Coleman, of Charlottesville, Va.; Major J. Johnson, Woodville, Wilkinson county, Mi.; Buckner H. Payne, Louisiana; Henry Ewing and Joseph W. Clay, Nashville, Ten.; William Dabney, Richmond City, Va.; Judge Charles Somner, Akron, Summit county, Ohio; and L. A. Sandidge, of May's Lick, Mason county, Ky., be appointed additional Trustees of Bethany College.

On motion of Robert Richardson, it was

Unanimously resolved, That the Secretary of this Board be instructed to send a copy of the Charter and the proceedings of the former and present meeting to the absent Trustees and those newly appointed.

On motion of William Stewart, it was

Unanimously resolved, That the Secretary be instructed to prepare for publication in the Millennial Harbinger and all other periodicals and papers, whose editors may be so kind as to insert them, the proceedings of the former and present meeting.

On motion of Robert Y. Henley, the Board adjourned, to meet on the second Monday of May, 1841.

THOMAS CAMPBELL, *President pro tem.*

W. F. M. ARNY, *Secretary.*

The building above alluded to is the *Steward's Inn*, or boarding-house, a capacious brick edifice, undertaken on my own individual responsibility, designed to accommodate one hundred students, besides occasional visitants. It will be covered in this season, and is hoped to be in readiness to receive Students about the first of October, 1841. It is desirable to have the College Proper and another edifice similar to that now in process, erected next summer. We want the *Family Mansion House* for a hundred lads to compose our model family. Unless our friends are very prompt in rendering assistance, these two buildings cannot possibly be raised next season, and we cannot go into operation so soon. If the College Proper be raised next summer, we may commence in one branch of the Institution on a small scale, with probably one hundred scholars. If the model family house also be raised next summer with the College, then we can have two great branches of the Institution in operation some time in 1842. Nay, if the brethren and friends of mankind are only half as benevolent and as prompt as they ought to be, we might in another year have the whole Institution in all its parts commenced. We intend a vigorous prosecution of this great object, the Lord willing, the ensuing season. If the Lord opens the hearts of his people, to be as liberal as he is kind to them, we will succeed: otherwise, this useful enterprize will flag. But this is what I cannot yet begin to think. A. C.

A LETTER FROM TIMOTHY TO THE APOSTLE PAUL.

To the Reverend PAUL, *Commissioner-General of Titles, and Fountain of Honor in the kingdom of Jesus Christ:* TIMOTHY, *Bishop of the Diocess of Asia Minor, and Metropolitan of Ephesus, wisheth health:—*

YOUR Grace saw fit to honor your humble servant and raise him above all the clergy in this diocess, for which you have my everlasting gratitude. You have raised me to such high distinction that I fear a

spirit of jealousy in the lower clergy. Already I have seen among my equals in talent and zeal a spirit of disappointment, which I have endeavored to overcome by giving them the best livings at my disposal. The inferior clergy are, indeed, all attention to their Bishop; they seem to vie with each other who shall be most subservient to my will.

As a shepherd under authority, I deem it my duty to give you an account of things under my care. Never did Prophet more clearly see and predict events than did your Grace when you told the resident Bishops of the church at Ephesus that "grievous wolves would enter in among them, not sparing the flock;" for truly, from "among themselves (that is, from the bench of Bishops in Ephesus) have men arisen, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them." Little did I think, when you parted with me in Ephesus, and requested me to remain there while you went into Macedonia, what was the true state of things among the clergy and laity of that great city. According to your request, however, I convoked the clergy, and, in episcopal form, I delivered my "charge." The clergy in attendance were a learned body, and they heard the "charge" with solemn interest, and each of them desired a copy. After which they met and voted a resolution of thanks for the "charge" as follows:—

'We, the Bishops and Clergy of the diocess of Asia Minor, in solemn convocation met, to express in a becoming manner our gratitude to the Primate of our diocess, do

'*Unanimously resolve*, That the thanks of this meeting be suitably inscribed on a golden medal, and be presented to the Metropolitan Bishop, for his most learned, most eloquent, most affecting, and most courteous "charge to the diocess of Asia Minor"—the 'charge' being, in our judgment, second to no literary production of this age.

(Signed) ANICIUS GALLUS, *President.*
EUXENUS PONTUS, *Secretary.*'

Since you were with us we have adopted, as to form, a few very important changes in the government of the churches. Upon trial we found that a plurality of Bishops over one church was not so beneficial as you hoped it would be. Men differ much in disposition, in knowledge, and in all attainments; and consequently the Bishops soon became jealous of each other, holding, as they did, offices equal in honor and profit. Dissensions soon arose among them, as you predicted, and the laity soon became divided among themselves, until on my return from a confirmation tour I found them all scattered like sheep without a shepherd. They had divided themselves into classes, under their several leaders; each Bishop having a portion of the flock for his particular charge. This state of things gave me a tide of grief and uneasiness, as I was interested mainly to keep the cause from general scandal. The leaders and their partizans had been bitterly inveighing against each other publicly and privately, to the injury of many souls, who looked upon these outbreakings as a sure consequence of our principles, and thus became prejudiced against Christianity. Old philosopher Seneca smiled complacently, and said, 'You Christians aim too high, not considering the weakness of human nature; you profess to crucify pride, and to preach meekness, and now you see that the preachers of humility themselves fall poor victims to ambition.' This wounded me sorely, coming as it did from so keen an observer.

Knowing as I did, that if all these bickerings should be generally known among the people, our usefulness would be at an end, I endeavored immediately to obviate the difficulty. So I called the Bishops together, and lectured them well on the subject of their jealousies and envyings. But I found it all in vain to try to reconcile them so as to bring them together again. Each Bishop contended that his flock would not consent to amalgamate again with the parent society; and all bore testimony to the happy state they had been in since the separation. I told them I very much feared it was the happiness of party, the quietude of man-ism, which had prevailed over love for Christ's sake; that these preferences for men were very unbecoming in those who loved the Lord Jesus Christ; and that as teachers they must have been preaching themselves, and not "Christ Jesus the Lord." To which they answered not a word. Finally, I received a communication from the parent stock, to this effect:—

'We, the undersigned, agree to form ourselves into a church, under the denomination of the *First* Christian Society in Ephesus; and do unanimously call upon our brother *Dionysius* to be ordained in due form over us, as our Bishop; who shall have power, when ordained, to choose any brother or brothers most agreeable to him, to serve him in the Deacon's office.'

From the first division I received another communication, proposing to call themselves the *Second* Christian Society in Ephesus, and electing Epaphroditus for their Bishop. And from the party under Demas another letter of similar import, asking to be called the *Third* Christian Society in Ephesus, and nominating Demas for the Pastor.

At the ordinations of each Bishop we had large meetings of the citizens, and in each sermon care was taken to impress the people with the idea that the separation had taken place for the convenience of the members, and not a whisper was heard of any disaffection or any unkind feeling between the parties. They mutually prayed for each other's welfare and happiness, and even seemed to persuade themselves that the pure desire of honoring the Lord had been their only motive in the separation. But time is the revealer of all secrets; for although they professed to pray for each other's prosperity as though it would have been pleasing to them to witness it, their deportment has shown that the very reverse was true. The people and the Bishops of each division had a similar interest, and it is painful to me merely to write of the unbrotherly arts of insidious peeping and whispering by which they have endeavored to underrate each other to prevent success. A visit from a talented brother from abroad to any of the parties, attended with the least partial success, would give the other parties a perfect fever for fear of an advantage being gained over them. The members of one party would try and use their influence with those of another to alienate them from their own Pastor and people. The spirit of rivalry seemed to eat out the spirit of true godliness; and what they never could have been persuaded to do purely for the truth, for the glory of God and the good of souls, they have cheerfully done through the inspirations of party excitement. In building large houses of worship and decorating them to suit the fashions of the age, they all went beyond their means, from the fear of being outdone or outshone. And another bad effect follow-

ed this state of things: from the determination not to be eclipsed, they were obliged to ask assistance from the irreligious world, who, when they had helped to build the house, felt an interest in the matter, and, of course, wished to have a voice in the appointment of preachers, &c. This tended to secularize the church, and to break down the distinction between the church and the world, as if the reverse of what our Lord said was true—"My kingdom is not of this world." And notwithstanding the care and the cunning which all parties manifested to keep the true grounds of separation from the people, the more inseeing part of them were perfectly aware of the whole matter, and of course all the efforts of the preachers were without effect on them. Alas! for poor humanity! I quake for the consequences in the great day of accounts, when the motives of all men will be known; and I fear that many a noisy profession will be found to have had its rise in the passions of men, and not in the will of God. I expect to meet you at Iconium; if not, I shall write you again.

Accept, Reverend "Father in God," the prayers and best wishes of your son in the faith, TIMOTHY.

NEW CHURCH IN BALTIMORE.

At a meeting of the undersigned disciples of Jesus Christ, held in the city of Baltimore, Maryland, on Lord's day, July 26th, 1840, the following Declaration was unanimously adopted:—

Whereas we have for a long time deeply deplored the desolate and distracted state of the cause of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in this city, and being fully impressed with the belief of what has now become a self-evident truth, viz.—that the condition of those professedly built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets is daily becoming worse, and that all hope of removing the causes of this desolation and ruin, and the consequent reformation of existing abuses having ceased, except by an entirely new organization; and being anxiously desirous of gathering in those that have already been scattered, as well as of uniting in one body the several bodies that have associated themselves together for worship: we therefore this day mutually agree to lay aside all minor considerations which may have heretofore operated as a cause of our separation, and to unite together on our individual responsibility, without reference to our former associations; and thus carry out the will of our Redeemer as expressed in his memorable prayer recorded in the 17th chapter of John's testimony.

In coming together as a congregation, having already been immersed upon a confession of our faith in the Messiah as the only begotten Son of God, we declare it to be our full purpose and determination to acknowledge no leader but Christ—no infallible teachers but the Apostles and Prophets—and no articles of belief but the Old and New Testaments, and the latter as containing our faith and the rules of our behaviour as Christians.

Regarding the church as built only on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; and it being the duty, honor, and happiness of the church to preserve the

unity of the spirit by the bond of peace, there being but "one body and one spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all,"—we here declare before God and each other, that we are determined, the Lord being our helper, to do the whole will of God, as far as we can understand it; to bear with one another when we may differ in matters of opinion; to contend only and earnestly for the faith formerly delivered to the saints; to be ever valiant for the truth; and to walk in obedience to the Lord alone, as our Prophet, Priest, and King.

Thus giving ourselves to the Lord and to one another according to the will of God, we agree to walk together as members of the family of God, under the government of the Prince of Peace—to whom be honor everlasting. Amen!

[Signed by:] WILLIAM CARMAN, HENRY MENTZEL, JAMES BLAKEY, JOSEPH THOMAS, ALEXANDER REED, ROBERT CRAIG, JOHN E. DAVIS, ALLEN L. INNES, JOHN SLOAN, LEE M'COMAS, ANDREW THOMPSON, SELINA MENTZEL, MARY BLAKEY, SARAH M'COMAS, LUCY-ANN HAHN, SUSAN JONES, SARAH SMITH, JANE HEBERT, ELIZABETH INNES, RUTH COCKEY, ELIZABETH MILLER, MARGARET MANSFIELD, JAMES G. HENSHALL, JAMES JACKSON, SAMUEL RUSSELL, MARY THOMPSON, ELLEN REED, HANNAH MOREL, LOUISA CRAIG, SARAH CRAIG, CLARISSA HENSHALL, TYMER BOULTON, LUCY HOLT, MARGARET HOLT, FRANCES WEITZELL, REBECCA STOCKDALE, RUTH M'VAY.

News from the Churches.

Georgetown, Kentucky, September 20, 1840.

At an annual meeting in Scott county, Ky., held at Dry Run Meeting House, on the 11th September, 1840, reports were received from the following congregations, being part of those embraced in the counties of Scott, Harrison, Bourbon, Nicholas, Fayette, Woodford, Franklin, and Pendleton.

1. Lexington, Fayette county, Evangelist —— Short, number of members, 250
2. Republican, Fayette county, 5 miles from Lexington, Evangelist T. Smith, 257
3. Sandersville, Fayette county, 2 miles from Lexington, Evangelist —— Short, 75
4. Antioch, Fayette county, between Lexington and Paris, 95
5. Cane Run, 6 miles north of Lexington, Evangelist S. G. Marshall, 50
6. Bethel, 5 miles north-west of Lexington, Evangelist, E. J. Fleming, now deceased, 30
7. Union, Bourbon county, Evangelists J. A. Gano and G. W. Williams, 198
8. Millersburg, Bourbon county, Evangelist Joshua Irvin, 160
9. Cowper's Run, near Paris, Bourbon county, Evangelist J. A. Gano, 50
10. Flat Run, Bourbon county, Evangelists William Parker and W. Morrow, 68
11. Cane Ridge, Bourbon county, Evangelists John A. Gano and John Rogers, 200
12. Mount Carmel, Bourbon county, Evangelist Joshua Irvin, 75
13. Bethlehem, Bourbon county, Evangelist William Morrow, 30
14. Clintonville, Bourbon county, Evangelist John Rodgers, 100
15. Paris, Bourbon county, Evangelist A. Raines, 197
16. North Middletown, Bourbon county, Evangelist A. Raines, 300
17. Cynthiana, Harrison county, Evangelists J. T Johnson and J. A. Gano, 184
18. Leesburg, Bourbon county, Evangelist J. A. Gano, 245
19. Republican, Bourbon county, Evangelist —— ——, 116
20. Forks of Elk Horn, Franklin county, Evangelist W. W. Whittington and C. H. Trabue, 78
21. Grassy Springs, Woodford county, Evangelist W. Whittington and L. J. Fleming, 175
22. Versailles, Franklin county, Evangelists C. J. Smith and A. Kendrick, 220
23. Carlisle, Nicholas county, Evangelist John Rogers, 342
24. Georgetown, Scott county, Evangelists S. G. Marshall, J T. Johnson, B. C. Rice and Martin Slaughter, 127
25. Stamping Ground, Scott county, Evangelists William Brown and R. C. Rice, 150

26. Sugar Ridge, Scott county, Evangelist R. C. Rice,	60
27. Big Eagle, Scott county, Evangelist R. C. Rice,	60
28. Dry Run, Scott county, Evangelists M. Slaughter and R. C. Rice,	90
29 Lytle's Fork, Scott county, Evangelist —— ——,	45
30. Falmouth, Pendleton county,	35
	4058

In the above calculations several congregations are omitted in those several counties as not being heard from. The probable number in Fayette is 500 in the churches at South Elk Horn, Providence, Athens, and David's Fork. In Harrison, 200; in Franklin, 300; in Benson, Bethel, and Franklin churches, &c.; in Woodford, 300; in New Union, Clear Creek, Mortonsville, &c.; Pendleton, 100; and Nicholas, 200; making 1600. In all eight counties, about 5658.

The reports presented 319 additions during the past year. There, however, were not all. You can see how the cause has progressed within a few years. There is every reason for rejoicing and for renewed efforts. We have had 20 valuable additions during our protracted annual meeting. It has been a season of refreshing to our souls.

J. T. JOHNSON.

Lexington, La Fayette county, Mo., September 7, 1840.

Our annual meeting in Upper Missouri for the present year, held at Independence, Jackson county, is just over. We heard from thirteen churches as follows:—

Lexington, La Fayette county,	No 94	Additions last year,	40
Dover, do.	72		51
Republican, do.	80		30
Richmond, Ray county,	61	Organized April last,	50 baptized
Stanley's do.	27		10 do.
Bear Creek, Platt county,	101		
Prairie Creek, do.	27		
Liberty, Clay county,	60		
Barry, do.	44		30 do
Independence, Jackson county,	157	Additions last year,	75
Clear Fork, Johnson county,	35		
Walnut Creek, do.	20	Thomas M'Bride, a veteran in the	
Big Creek, Reaves county,	34	army of the faithful, is their preacher.	
Lone Jack, Jackson county,	14		
Total number,	826		

F. R. Palmer preaches for the church at Independence; A. H. T. Payne, Liberty and Barry; James Lovelady and James Cox, Bear, Prairie Creek, and Barry; T. N. Gaines, Lexington, Richmond, and Dover; Duke Young, Republican and Dover; Jacob Warriner, Stanleys.

It would I fear occupy too much room to give the time of organization of each church and their officers to be admitted in your periodical. Suffice it to say, that the majority are young churches, and zealous in the cause We had a good representation from all the churches heard from. The distance of separation formed no barrier to the meeting together of the kindred spirits, although separated by some 70 or 80 miles; one of our teaching brethren J. P. Lancaster come upwards of 100 miles, and all can say it was good for us thus to have met together; for, as 'iron sharpeneth iron, so a man sharpeneth the the countenance of his friends.' We had the pleasure of becoming acquainted with many choice spirits from Platt and Clay counties, as also to commune with those of former acquaintance in Ray Jackson, and La Fayette.

A few more such brethren as Morehead, Jacobs, and Warden, of Ray; Caldwell, Hackensmith, and Hansbro, of Jackson; Vancamp, Whittlesey, and Foster, of La Fayette, and the truth must triumph here We trust, however, that there is now being enlisted for the Lord Jesus in this country an army whose pious and orderly deportment will reflect the light of heaven, until ignorance, darkness, and superstition shall be dispelled from the land, and the glorious gospel of the blessed Jesus shall shine into the hearts of our fellow-citizens, and free them from the bondage of sin and priestcraft. It is unnecessary for me to say all parties and sects oppose us, for as in ancient times, so now, and our experience testifies that in all cities and countries every thing but bonds and prisons await us. But none of these things move us; our course is onward and upward!

The teaching brethren were alive to the cause; to convert sinners and to encourage and build up the brethren in their most holy faith, and to engage in thanksgiving, prayer, and praise to our heavenly Father, for the success of the truth in our country, was our prime object; consequently we heard nothing of 'our name,' 'the name,' the 'one family name.' Seven or eight sinners heard, believed, and were immersed; six or seven others added by letter—making about fourteen additions. The churches generally are building houses for worship: some have built. One is building in Lexington, 55 by 42 feet, at which place our next annual meeting will be held on Friday before the first Lord's day in October, 1841. You thought you would visit Missouri at the time you visit Indiana and Illinois. Can you tell us certain when you will come?

T. N. GAINES.

Lewisburg, Tennessee, September 1, 1840.

I am prompted to write you from what I have seen and felt recently. Yesterday a meeting closed at Liberty meeting house, (the church where my membership is.) During the meeting there were about 50 persons immersed, and several of the old Baptists added who have stood aloof for years. Another protracted meeting closed at Robison's Fork the first week in August, nine miles from me, at which upwards of 50 were added by baptism, and one at Green Hill about the middle of the month. The brethren then came to Liberty, and upwards of 30 were baptized before they left; so that we think at least 150 were added at the three meetings. Brethren Cantrell and Griffing, our evangelists, myself, and some others attended part of the time. I thank the Lord that I have lived to see the word of the Lord so mightily prevail, where there has been so much opposition.

I have not forgotten your request in relation to the churches in Marshall county; but I am not prepared to report, but expect to do so this fall. There has been considerable additions to the most of our churches in eighteen months; but brother Cantrel will assist me soon in making a full report of our progress.

According to appointment there will be a public debate on the 14th instant, about five miles from my house, on the operation of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of sinners, the subject and mode of baptism There will be two on each side—brethren Cantrel and Fanning, or James C. Anderson, on one side, and Messrs. M'Millan and Warren on the other, both Presbyterians. WILLIS HOPWOOD

Debates on the spirit of enthusiasm, and of fanaticism—on regeneration without faith—on regeneration antecedent to, and independent of, the Word—may be useful and necessary; but debates upon *whether the Spirit of God exerts any influence on the conversion of sinners, or in the sanctification of saints*, cannot be profitable to saint or sinner; and, in my opinion, worse than useless at the present time. We affirm and teach the indwelling of the Spirit of God in the obedient, and not in the disobedient. We affirm and teach the conversion of sinners by the Spirit of God, not without the word nor independent of it, but by the word of God. In one sentence, *we deny regeneration by the Spirit without the Word, and affirm regeneration or sanctification by the Spirit through the Word.* We use regeneration in this proposition in the common acceptation In preaching or in debating on this question, our brethren would, in my judgment, do well to confine themselves to this practical view of the subject, and leave metaphysical and camp-meeting regeneration to the Old Baptists, Methodists, and Presbyterians. A. C

Princess street, Dundee, Scotland, August 4, 1840.

I take the liberty of writing you a few lines on the present occasion, by a friend going out to the state of Kentucky. Although not personally acquainted with you, I have learned much from your writings, and feel anxious to inform you what is going on here in regard to the ancient gospel, and how it made its way here The first publication which made its appearance was your essay on *Church Order*, which was read eagerly by all who could obtain it; but nothing as yet appeared about the ancient gospel. Next came the Christian Messenger: then it began gradually to be developed. Afterwards came the famous debate with Robert Owen, which drove away the prejudices on men's minds and created an eager demand for the Messenger. This publication is well calculated to restore primitive Christianity: it has got a very extensive circulation, and is published now almost throughout the length and breadth of the land. A church was formed here about ten months ago, taking the word of God alone for its guide in all things, and now forms a part of those who are contending for the *ancient order of things*. A great many have believed and obeyed the gospel, and are still increasing. Great and mighty is the truth, and it shall prevail. All the conflicting sects and parties are tottering, and part have fallen before the ancient gospel, which is the power of God to every one who believes. In spite of infidelity, which is rapidly increasing in this country, it is even ashamed to show its face where the gospel is proclaimed faithfully. Discussions have been held here on the social system; but none of them ever dared to discuss the evidences of Christianity, although challenges have been given to them by some of us But it always follows as a natural consequence, when Christianity is corrupted, there infidelity in all its forms prevails. As you were the means of restraining the system in America, we should be exceedingly happy to see you face to face, combatting the enemy as you did at Cincinnati. I saw in a number of the Messenger some time ago, that you have it in contemplation of coming to this country. May we expect to see you next year? The churches in England and Scotland, and many others, are waiting in expectation. Nothing is wanting but bold proclaimers; "the harvest is great, but the laborers are few" I should be exceedingly happy, and take it as a great favor, to let me hear from you direct the first opportunity. May the Lord guide and prosper you in all your ways!

J. G. AINSLILY.

It would afford me much pleasure to visit England, Scotland, and Ireland, and I still promise myself the pleasure of so doing; but to fix the time is at present not in my power. I must have the College in operation first. A. C.

We believe it due to the brethren at Harrodsburg, to publish the following:—

Harrodsburg, Kentucky, September 12, 1840.

In the August number of the Harbinger, page 366, you remark on the subject of *our name*, "But had he" (the Editor of the Heretic Detector) "been at Harrodsburg, he would have said, 'For there is one Lord, one faith, one baptism, and one family name.'" From which I infer that you allude to the manner in which new converts were received into the church during our great meeting in May; and that you had some reason to believe that the members of the Harrodsburg church have adopted the *new* plan of receiving members, by requiring that they shall take upon them the exclusive name of Christian, as the family name.

This, however, is not the fact, except that in so far as the church (having not been consulted) suffered it, rather than create unpleasant feelings. It is true that I have not heard a great number of the congregation express an opinion, but those whom I have heard speak on the subject (with one exception) are decidedly opposed to it.

It has been thought by some of our brethren with whom I have conversed, that you ought to be informed of this; and the sketch I am giving you is more for the purpose of letting you know the mind of the church, than to array the names of the actors in this (as I conceive) unscriptural procedure. Brother C. J. Smith fell in with their views at the time; but he told me a few days since that his impression *then* was, that the name was given in contradistinction from all *sectarian* names; but that he is *now* convinced that it was improper, even to view it in that light, and that he is determined never so to act again.

I have heard one of our Elders say, that although he has always been in favor of the name Christian, he was equally decided that it was wrong to put such questions to persons applying for membership.

They also at that meeting required the applicants for membership, to say that they took *the Bible alone*, and that, too, in the face of the fact that the church in Harrodsburg never has acknowledged any other rule by which to be governed, than the Bible furnishes; and all applicants must so understand it.

The *honesty* of these brethren in setting such a *precedent* cannot counteract the evil that may result from it, if it *is wrong*.

It may be that the first creed that was ever written might have contained nothing but truth; but it may with equal propriety be said, that it was a mere human production at best; from which all the errors of creeds have since originated; and however pure the intentions of our worthy brethren may be in requiring persons who apply for membership to say they take the name Christian alone, and the Bible alone, to me it appears that they, in their zeal to guard the church against the adoption of a creed, have in fact made the *germ* of one; to which *may* (by designing men) be added scores of questions that will subvert and raze the very foundation upon which the present reformation commenced.

WALTER WHEATLY.

Query 1. If Elders of churches fail to do their duty in promptly checking the introduction of any unscriptural practice in their congregation, by evangelist or others; can a private member, without a breach of order, call the attention of the church to the fact?

Query 2. Who has a right to *decide* in the investigation of this matter—the Elders or the congregation?* W. W.

Louisville, Kentucky, September 18, 1840.

I removed to this place the first of June last, since which time my labors in the gospel have been confined principally to the city. I have delivered two courses of lectures—one on Christian privileges and responsibilities; the other on Christian union; in which I showed the necessity of it, and laid down the principles on which it must be effected. Next Lord's day I am to commence a series on *The Gospel*.

You perceive that my attention has been directed principally to the church. I have endeavored to get the brethren harnessed for the work. We have good materials here to build up a church eminent for piety. All that is required to insure success, is concerted action. We have six meetings a-week—three on Lord's day, besides the Sunday school—two for preaching and one for breaking the loaf; and three through the week—two for prayer and praise, and one for the study of the scriptures. Our prayer meetings are held at private houses in different parts of the city. The number of our hearers is increasing. Every thing is moving on pleasantly. May the Lord prosper us!

Notwithstanding we have not made much of an effort to increase the number of our church—(our great object having been to teach those we have, the means of extensive attainments in holiness and piety)—still we have had perhaps more than *twenty* additions—*twelve* or more by immersion. Half the number during the visit of our beloved A. Kendrick, recently; the visit before and since he was here. There is a prospect, I think, for a number of additions.

* These questions will come up in our 'Difficulties in Churches.' Meanwhile I will only say, that private members, or an individual or two, cannot, *without a breach of order*, introduce into the congregation any measure reprobatory of the eldership, but through themselves. And whenever any matter assumes so much importance as to call for an appeal to the congregation, the elders that rule in the fear of God will lay it before the congregation.——A. C.

Send all your good preachers to Kentucky. We will take care of them. Our churches are not so far advanced as to do without preachers, nor will they be for a thousand years to come.

B. F. HALL.

Cleaveland, Ohio, September 9, 1840.

May this find you safely arrived at home! Brother Moss and myself kept up the meeting till Tuesday night Ten in all obeyed. On Monday there was something said by several of the brethren in relation to the duties of the brethren in sustaining evangelists. A very fine impression was made. Brother Moss excited them by emulation: he offered to be one of four, who should give the sum of 500 dollars to some brother whom they should select, to visit all the churches in the Western Reserve, to arouse them especially to this duty. He made the appeal, and immediately three brethren, C. Hendershot, of Euclid, —— Webster and —— Miller, of Mentor, arose to bear their part in the noble work.

AMOS SUTTON HAYDEN.

Pulaski county, Virginia. September 4, 1840.

We have had brethren Coleman and Goss with us. They are no disgrace to Eastern Virginia. Men raised on the sea of Galilee, who were inured to the exposures of a fisher's life are constitutionally better adapted to the self denials of the pioneer in the Christian religion, than most people of this age. But when our manners are reduced to greater simplicity, giant labors with their giant results are to be expected from us. I may say much good was done by their visit. The gospel was illustrated and enforced by new figures and modes of argument in great strength Few I think would have had the temerity to contradict. Nine were baptized while they were here, and about thirty since I saw you in Charlottesville.

We prefer the name Christian in this section, because with this age it is more descriptive than any name which is equally covenanted; but we would rather take the trouble to enumerate all the Testament titles in every allusion to ourselves, than to endanger the least schism in the great and glorious unit—the body of Christ.

CHESTER BULLARD.

Sullivan, Ohio, July 18, 1840.

The following unjust and ungenerous remarks appeared in the Cross and Journal of the 14th of February last, under the signatures of G. D. Simmons and A. P. Mather; and as they were designed to deceive the public we wish to correct them through the Harbinger After speaking of a meeting held in Huntington, they observe—

"From thence we immediately repaired to Sullivan, and found that place deluged with Universalism, Campbellism, &c.; but notwithstanding the combined influence, the glorious Jesus appeared in the chariot of his grace, riding from 'conquering to conquer,' and the revival is still moving forward with power."

It is needless to observe that there was no Campbellism here, except a thing that Simmons and Mather brought along with them; but as it was aimed at the disciples, such as 'were called Christians first at Antioch,' we deem it our duty to say that there were only 14 disciples members of the church of God in this place, at the time their meeting was held; one of whom, our Elder, being absent at the time, and perhaps about half that number of Universalists; while the Baptists, Methodists, and Congregationalists had each a society here of several years standing. Also, the vile insinuation that there was a combination with Universalism to oppose them, is utterly false. How any man that fears God could pen such an article we presume not to say. It is true that the Baptists in connexion with the Congregationalists held a meeting in this place, commencing on the 18th day of December last, which continued four weeks in succession; during which our sentiments were constantly misrepresented without the least opportunity for self-defence, and the Disciples were held up to the world as being the offscouring of the community—as being beneath Universalists and Deists; and not only this, but Mr. Mather even condescended to point the finger of scorn, and bestow upon us from 'the *sacred* desk' such polite expressions as these: 'Smiling devil,' 'crying devil,' 'sedate, sober, thinking devil,' 'like the devil with silk gloves on,' 'impudent puppy,' and the like, with many others too numerous to mention.

Perhaps enough has already been said, but one thing farther we wish to mention as it was a public thing, and as we have understood that Mather has been denying it about the country where he goes. On one occasion, as the audience was large, composed in part of individuals from neighboring townships, an intelligent sister recollecting that Mr. Simmons had remarked at the commencement of the meeting that they were willing any errors should be corrected, and feeling it her duty, arose to correct some base falsehoods that Mather had just stated, he, unwilling to be corrected, called upon the Trustees of the house to silence her. Whereupon one of the deacons arose and said, "I am Trustee of the house—sit down Miss P., or leave the house," rushing through the audience at the same time, until he approached and laid his innocent hands upon her with the manifest design of putting her to silence, regardless of events. However, being entreated to desist by the sisters of other denominations, (some leaving the house,) he finally relinquished his grasp, and the sister took her seat and invoked the blessing of Heaven to rest upon her foes. Mr Mather attempted to resume his discourse; but, alas! he had attempted to deliver a discourse on brotherly love! At the close of their meeting they baptized 13. But notwithstanding such vituperation and abuse, and the combined influence of the sects in opposing the simplicity of the gospel, the glorious Jesus has since appeared in our midst

in the chariot of his grace, riding from conquering to conquer, till 23 have become willing to acknowledge that they are 'not ashamed of the gospel, because it is the power of God for salvation to every one who believes, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek,' two of whom were from the Baptists, and some others have acknowledged that the scales have fallen from their mental vision. We have also received two by letter, making 25 additions in all to the church of Christ in this place since the commencement of this year.—We praise the Lord for his goodness, and will only add, May the Father of mercies bring our traducers to a speedy repentance for their evil deeds, and preserve them from destruction until they learn to say Shibboleth.

MILO CARLETON,
JOHN P MANN.

The above was written by my request, and it may be relied upon as correct.

SYLVANUS PARMELY.

Springfield, Miss., September 12, 1840.

We are doing nothing extraordinary in behalf of the Bible in this country, at this time; but are hopeful of better times. Brothers Hazleton, M'Bride, Potter, and myself were at a three days' meeting in Polk county, in what is called Crisp's Prairie, which commenced on this day week: at which place there was an addition of about 25 to the little congregation at that place: the addition consisted of some scattered brethren, some backsliders reclaimed, and some 8 or 10 immersions. The brethren's hearts were made glad in hopes of better times, and the prospect is good for a large increase in that region. May the good Lord bless them!

JOEL H. HADEN.

Wadsworth, Ohio, September 9, 1840.

I was on my road to Lima, Stark county, when I left you in Akron. The Methodists had just ended a camp-meeting three-fourths of a mile from our meeting. They said a great many things against us as a matter of course; but the doctrine of the Galilean fishermen took the day. Twenty-two persons made the good confession, and were immersed. Brethren J. Whitacre and J. W. Lanphear met me there. You need not, therefore, wonder at our success. I will try and see you in company with my wife and brother Whitacre the last of this month or the first of next.

J. H. JONES.

Pleasant Hill, Randolph, Missouri, September 15, 1840.

Having been often cheered on hearing of the progress of Bible truth through the medium of the Harbinger, I take the liberty of informing you of the progress of the good cause in my section of the western world. I have immersed eleven within a few weeks back. One of that number was an *old* man, borne down with the weight of 78 years or thereabouts, between 30 and 40 of which he has been a member of the Methodist church, as he informed me; but he became convinced of the propriety of obeying the gospel in being immersed. The first Lord's day of this month I planted a congregation of Disciples in Bloomington, Macon county. They number about 20. There is a goodly number of Disciples scattered over this wilderness country, and in several places a sufficient number to form a respectable church, and they are anxious to be constituted; but proclaimers are few among us, so much so that there is a great many sections not visited at all. May the Lord send faithful laborers into the harvest, many fields of which are already ripe.

ALLEN WRIGHT.

Georgetown, Kentucky, September 4, 1840.

I have just returned from an annual meeting which was held about 5 miles from Danville. The preaching brethren present were, Thomas Smith, Beggs, and the President of our College, brother Shannon. The meeting continued from Friday until Wednesday. Forty-one additions were made to the good cause. It was a most glorious season of rejoicing. Brother Shannon is all that we could wish. I have never seen the brethren more delighted with any man. The expectations of the people were more than realized. We had a meeting of

our Trustees on Thursday at Harrodsburg, and entered into incipient measures to complete our buildings. I then held a meeting of four days in Garrard county, when 10 additions were made to the congregation. Praised be the Lord for all his goodness! The prospects were most flattering for many more additions at both places.

J. T. JOHNSON.

Paris, Kentucky, July 8, 1840.

We have recently had six accessions to the church at this place. They were, it is believed, excited to serious reflection by Mr. Maffit, the celebrated Methodist revivalist, who within the last month spent about two weeks here. This Mr. Maffit possesses tremendous revivalist powers! but seems incapable of giving to his mourners the gospel answer; so that they *mourn* and *mourn on*, under such conditions from his ambassadorship as the following: "*Come to the foot of the cross!*" "*Look up! Look up! Look up!!*" The people love to have it so! The divine response to the question, "What shall I do to be saved?" is neglected or rejected, and the responses of men are preferred to those which God has explicitly and authoritatively announced. *O! the times! O! the manners!*

A. RAINES.

Orange township, Meigs county, Ohio, August 5, 1840.

I sit down to give you an account of the progress of the gospel in this region of country since I came into it. At the co-operation meeting held in Rutland in the first week of March last, I received "a special call" from the brethren to labor in this and adjoining counties in conjunction with brother Gaston. On the last Saturday and Lord's day of March we commenced operations at Parker's Landing, near the mouth of Leading Creek, where twenty-one happy converts obeyed the Lord, and two others who had been backsliders were reclaimed.—At Shade River Church we immersed one; at Long Bottom, one; at the Salem Church brother Hubble immersed two; at same place I attended with brethren Hubble and Mitchell, and nine were immersed and twenty-four others added. At Parker's Landing I attended with brother Mitchell, when sixteen were immersed, and three others added. This closed the month of April

In the beginning of May I went with brother Gaston to Lodi Church, in Athens county, where six obeyed the gospel. At Thomas' Fork Church brother Gaston had immersed two; brother Rallston five, and two others added. At Salem Church, where I attended with brother Hubble, three obeyed. At Parker's Landing held meeting with brother Gaston, where eight obeyed. At Pomeroy brother Gaston immersed two. In Rutland township I immersed two, and brother Hubble one. This closed the month of May.

Beginning of June met with brother Gaston at Thomas Fork—immersed forty-two, and received one from the Regular Baptists; (one of those immersed was an intelligent Presbyterian.) At Salem Church I immersed three; near Vinton, Gallia county, brother Gaston immersed one; at Chester, one, at Parker's Landing I immersed four, at Shade River brother Gaston immersed two, and at Long Bottom one; at Thomas' Fork I immersed three, and received one whom the Methodists had immersed to keep from us, but in vain. This ended June.

Beginning of July brother Sargent, in Rutland township, immersed two, and one other immersed person was received. Attended with

brother Gaston at Parker's Landing, and immersed one. At Lodi I immersed one; at Federal Creek, Athens county, brother Gaston immersed ten in the midst of much contention; at Chester he immersed one; at Rutland township I immersed two persons, one of whom, through protracted illness, had to be carried to the water's edge. I supported her while going into the water—immersed her—and *it did not kill her!!!* Her health is somewhat better. At Parker's Landing I immersed one more. In Chester township brother Castle immersed one. This closes July.

Yesterday we had a glorious victory over superstition and sectarianism. Brother Gaston had an appointment near Chester, in the strong hold of Methodism. Some immersions were expected. A large audience attended. Four came out, three of them Methodists. One of them was opposed at the water's edge by her mother; but she obeyed her Master. When the others were immersed another lady (a Methodist) expressed a desire to be immersed, when a great struggle commenced to prevent it, some getting between her and the water; some assailed brother Gaston, some the writer of this, some another brother, and a general debate took place. One had a sort of swooning operation, and gave us a long sharp lecture, and one "believed a religion that comes right down from heaven, and does not believe in the Bible;" but truth triumphed, and the woman was immersed. This makes the whole number of additions one hundred and thirty-six since the last Lord's day in March. Bless the Lord, O my soul!

In many respects the prospects are encouraging. Some of the churches are in pretty good order; and wherever this is the case the proclamation of the gospel has been attended with success. I regret that all who embrace the gospel doctrine do not exhibit the ancient order of things. The preaching of the gospel is thereby paralyzed. Indeed, I never before felt the full weight of Paul's remark, that "which cometh on me daily the care of all the churches;" for when I could rejoice at the prosperity of some, I am cast down at the deficiency of others—"cast down, but not in despair." There are in the bounds of this district about twelve churches, and perhaps five hundred members, with an extended and widely extending influence throughout society. I have confidence that the weapons of our warfare are mighty through God to the pulling down of the strong holds of the adversary. "Blessed Jubilee! let thy glorious morning dawn!"

J. C. A.

Ohio, August 5, 1840.

A question has been agitated in some of the churches of a delicate nature, and seemed likely to produce much disaffection. I would be much gratified, and I believe the brotherhood satisfied, could you be induced to give us an essay on the subject in the Harbinger. The question is, Have the sisters a right to teach? If so, Who? When? Where? In other words, Have the sisters a right to deliver lectures, exhortations, and prayers in the public assembly of the church of God?

J. C. A.

Paul says, "I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man; but to learn in silence." 1 Tim. ii. 12. I submit to Paul, and teach the same lesson. A. C.

Martinsburg, Ohio, October 3, 1840.

I write you to-day, informing you of the success of the gospel. Some twelve persons have lately been immersed in the congregation near here. A letter from D. M'Cann, from brother Harrison Jones, gives an account of 133 immersions in three months.

On Wednesday last I held a public discussion with a Mr. James Hays, a public speaker among the people sometimes called "New Lights." I think that signal good will result. Many of his brethren conceive that he failed utterly in sustaining his positions. Our proposition was, "Was baptism, preceded by faith and repentance, appointed by divine authority in order to the remission of sins and induction into the Christian kingdom?" He has declared he will never debate again.

The strength of that body is fast declining in the West. Here is their strongest hold, and even here some of their best men have lately left them. Two of their principal preachers have recently come out in favor of the ancient order. I suppose you have heard of Dr. Wm. Hays, who recently made a visit to Kentucky for the purpose of "restoring his brethren from Campbellism," and who returned preaching the faith he aimed to destroy. He was unquestionably their best man; a fine classical scholar, an excellent public speaker, and a man of unimpeachable character. He brought some thirty of his brethren with him in this county. He is very devotedly engaged in the good work, and well his quondam brethren know that his influence and teaching will do much to shatter their present sectarian principles. Elder Thomas Cotterell, another very popular preacher among them, is also among us. He started to Kentucky on the same errand with Doctor Hays—is still there proclaiming the faith once delivered to the saints.

How pleasing to see so many of those choice spirits carrying out the principles upon which they started! May Heaven bless every effort which has for its object the triumph of correct religious principles!

J. B. FERGUSON.

Hillsborough, Va., August 25, 1840.

Brother Campbell—Since I parted with you in Charlottesville we have had none of the labors of our promised Evangelists. I hope they are doing an important work, so as not to be able to visit us. We have had several additions by immersion to the Smyrna congregation; seven or eight, if I remember right—two Methodists. I rejoice to see the influence of the apostolic gospel, even among our opponents, who have built a house for *their worship*, within half a mile of Smyrna. On last Lord's day we had to immerse one, as we had done for several Lord's days preceding. When our company arrived, behold a Methodist preacher, the circuit rider in charge, was in the water with eight of his members, immersing them. This he was compelled to do in order to keep them *in Methodism*. What a commentary is such conduct on Methodism, or Paidobaptism! This proves to demonstration that *the preachers* make the Methodist, but not the Christian, if they can avoid it. Now every thinking pious man, who is not a *class leader*, *circuit rider*, or some other antiscriptural officer, must see that it is as easy for the sectarian preachers to unite all Christians, if they would only become Christians themselves and teach the Christian religion as Jesus Christ and his Apostles have revealed it and recorded it in the

New Testament, as it is to make Methodists, except that of the *cross in immersion.*

I have often thought upon the language of the Apostle Paul to the Ephesians: "And that he might *reconcile both* (Jew and Gentile) unto God by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby; and came and preached peace to you that were afar off, (the Gentiles,) and to them that were nigh. For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father. Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God; and are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone; in whom all the building, fitly framed together, groweth unto a holy temple of the Lord, in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God through the Spirit." Now these privileges were enjoyed equally by Jew and Gentile, *by the cross*; which cross had slain the enmity between the Jew and Gentile, and placed them in the kingdom of heaven on earth—upon the same foundation, by the same means.

Now the question is, Who believes the doctrine of the inspired Apostles, and proves it by his practice? This is a matter of vast importance in this day and generation. When the children of Israel had taken possession of the land of Canaan and set up the tabernacle of God in Shiloh, the tribe of Reuben, the tribe of Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh returned to their families and possessions in the land of Gilead on the other side of Jordan, where they built a great altar. The nine tribes and a half hearing of this, assembled together to go up to war against their brethren for building an altar when there was one in Shiloh where all were welcome. Such conduct by the two and a half tribes was considered rebellion against God, and turning from following him. If their land was unclean, they were exhorted to return to Canaan and dwell among the children of Israel, but not to build any altar by the side of the altar of God. This was Jeroboam's sin, which ultimately drove the nation into Babylon, where they remained seventy years.

Now Paul informs us he was made a prisoner of Jesus Christ for the Gentiles, because he had proclaimed a doctrine that brought Jew and Gentile into the church of Jesus Christ by the same means, and built upon the same foundation. Let us, then, turn to the circumstance and cause of his arrest and imprisonment—Acts xxi. 17–25, inclusive. Here we see the cause of complaint by the Jews:—he would have nothing to do with *infant membership* or customs of such professors; but, on the contrary, James, with all the Elders, expressly informs us, "As touching the Gentiles which believe, we have written and *concluded* that they observe no such thing, save only that they keep themselves from things offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication." It appears at this time Paul was arrested, made a prisoner, and I do not believe he was ever after this allowed to go at large to proclaim the gospel among the churches and to the world. Thus the Apostle to the Gentiles had to suffer imprisonment for opposing infant membership in the Christian church, while some *profess* to proclaim his doctrine in order to justify infant sprinkling or pouring to make them such. Will you say, What was *this cross*, and how this *enmity* was slain by it, to reconcile such con-

tending parties as the Jews and Gentiles were in the apostolic day? We see among the Paidobaptist sects, that if one of *their* preachers believes the gospel and is immersed, and proclaims what he believes, it produces *such enmity among them* that they are as Jews and Gentiles were before the gospel day.——Yours sincerely,

THOMAS M. HENLEY.

The cross of Christ, or *his death* upon a tree, reconciled Jew and Gentile, because the enmity between them was crucified. Both were equally received by Christ. The pride of the Jew and the resentment of the Greek were slain by the facts that both had sinned; that Christ died for both, and received the circumcision and the uncircumcision on the same terms and conditions. Thus they were reconciled to God and to one another by the cross of Christ. And this same death upon a cross of this Divine Redeemer does now, as it did at first, with a freshness and a power that time can never wither nor impair, slay the pride of the human heart, its enmity against God, against man, and introduces to the heart a divine and heavenly peace and love, to which all earth-born sons of men are strangers who have not been begotten by the Spirit and born from above. A. C.

LITERARY MEN IN WEDLOCK.

MILTON'S first wife, whom he married from a sudden fancy, was unable to endure his literary habits; and finding her house too solitary for her romping disposition, beat his nephews and conveyed herself away at the expiration of her honey-moon. The wife of Bishop Cooper became so jealous of his books, that she consigned the labor of many years to the flames; and the alleged reason why Lady Seville destroyed the most valuable manuscripts of Sir Henry, was, that they engrossed too much of his time.

The reason of the like fortune to a literary man, Professor Cross founds in the ignorance and vulgar-mindedness of the wife; and hence a motive for the exertions of the literati in the cause of female education. He says, "If such a wife (as Seville had) be neglected, she will imagine that the time her husband spends in his study should be devoted to her personal service; and if she is not neglected, so mortifying to an illiterate woman is the infinite and unapproachable superiority of an accomplished man, that she cannot obliterate from her mind the harrowing conviction that his attention to her, though the most tender and soothing, is the insolence of familiarity or the pride of condescension. Her inferiority, she is aware, cannot be concealed from him, and if she is not neglected and avoided, the most favorable construction she puts upon her conduct is, that she is pitied; and such is the mysterious structure of the female heart, that, rather than be pitied, she would be despised."

Equator of the Weekly Press.

OBITUARIES.

MILLERSBURG, Ky., September 6th, 1840.

Dear brother Campbell—THE object of the present communication is, as you will see, not only to inform you of the death of our beloved brother N. L. LINDSEY, but that the community may know how he died. He died at his residence in Bourbon county, near North Middletown, on the 4th of September instant, at 6 o'clock A. M. aged 52 years, in the full assurance of a happy immortality. The church at North Middletown, of which he was one of the Elders, has sustained a loss not soon to be repaired. Faithful, affectionate, and frank in the discharge of his duty, he had gained the confidence and esteem not only of his own congregation, but of his brethren wherever he was known. For some time before his death he seemed to have detached his mind in a great measure from the things of this world, and his great desire appeared to be the success of the Messiah's kingdom. He was fast growing in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and while he taught others the way of truth, he lived in strict accordance with what he taught; and, thanks to Almighty God, his death was as triumphant as his life had been exemplary. On the evening of the 3d of September I was in his neighborhood at the burial of a relative of mine, and hearing that brother and sister Lindsey were not well, I went, as I was in the habit of doing, to spend the evening with them, and know how they were. But O! who can describe my feelings when approaching brother Lindsey's bed-side, and laying my hand upon his forehead, I found it covered with the cold dew of death. He at that time was not apprised of his situation; but as soon as he was told that his case was exceedingly doubtful, he said, "Brother Irvin, I wish you to tell all my brethren with whom you may meet that this is the hour that I am not afraid." A friend of his that had been present a considerable part of the day, and who was exerting himself to save him, said, 'Col. Lindsey, do not suffer yourself to be excited." To whom he replied, "I am not excited; but I wish you all to know that I am not afraid to die." Soon afterwards he asked, "Is this death?" and being answered rather in the affirmative, he said, "Jesus can make a dying bed feel soft as downy pillows are." After a little pause he said, "I wish you all to know that I am now fully satisfied with the faith that I have professed; and I only have to regret that I did not sooner engage in the service of God."

"Time, [said he] like an ever-rolling stream,
Bears all its sons away;
They fly forgotten as a dream
Dies at the op'ning day."

But language cannot do justice to the parting scene. Sister Lindsey was lying in an adjoining room, unable to arise without assistance. Being told of brother Lindsey's situation, she requested to be taken to his room. When brought to his bed-side, in the agony of grief she exclaimed, "Oh! my dear, I cannot give you up—I cannot let you go—you must not leave me—we must not part." Said he, with all the mildness of a dying saint, "Lavinia, my dear, do not talk so; Oh! be resigned to the will of God. We have spent many pleasant days together: this is the last till we shall meet to part no more. Oh! have

fortitude—be resigned." His daughter, 13 years of age, being the only one of his daughters present, came to his bed-side and threw herself on the bosom of her dying father and embraced him. Said he, "My daughter, you have lately put on the Lord Jesus; be dutiful and kind to your mother; remember that this is the first commandment with promise." Soon afterwards he ceased to speak, and yielded up his spirit into the bosom of his Father and his God. "Oh!" said I, while I stood with my hand upon his breast and watched the expiring taper of life, "Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his." I could say with the Poet, though great the affliction—

"Sweet is the scene when Christians die,
When holy souls retire to rest;
How mildly beams the closing eye!
How gently heaves th' expiring breast!
Triumphant smiles the victor's brow,
Fann'd by some guardian angel's wing:
O, Grave, where is thy victory now?
And where, O Death is now thy sting?"

J. IRVIN.

A very affecting description of the last scene of brother FLEMMING'S useful life, and of the intimate affection between him and brother A. Kendrick, written by this excellent brother, is received, and were it not that we have already noted that event, we should have published it *in extenso*. I have room only to quote the passage concerning his age:—"It could be said of him, with more propriety than of any one personally known to me, that the first emotions of pain he ever caused were caused by his departure—

"A good man and an angel!
How thin the veil between!"

Some may think me extravagant, but those who know him well will say that I have not exaggerated his worth. I never knew nor heard of a man who indulged one hard feeling towards him during the 42 or 43 years which he spent on earth." A. K.

GREEN, Ohio, October 1, 1840.

Brother Campbell—I mentioned to you some weeks since that a brother, formerly of Madison county, Kentucky, named WILLIAM J. PASLEY, had accidentally fallen in amongst us, on his way from New Haven, Connecticut, where he had been attending College, to Franklin College, New Athens, and that I supposed he was far gone with pulmonary consumption. My fears have been realized. He died at my residence on Tuesday last, the 29th September. I am happy to say that he died in the faith and hope of the gospel. He bore his illness with scarcely a murmur or complaint of any kind, and met death with the greatest fortitude and resignation. How painful the thought that one so young, so intelligent, and so good, should fall with scarcely the tribute of a single tear—"a stranger in [to him] a strange land." The thought, when we placed his body in the coffin, that there was neither mother, sister, father, nor brother to take the last fond affectionate look, was almost too much for my fortitude. We are, however, thankful to our Father in heaven that his providence guided him to our

neighborhood to lay down his life. From him we have all learned lessons of patience and devotion, which I trust we shall never forget. For the satisfaction of his friends and acquaintances in Kentucky, would it not be well to mention his death in the Harbinger, and to assure them that all that could be done by sympathy, attention, and medicine, to alleviate his sufferings, was done? When he found he could not pursue his journey, but must die, he requested that I should read his certificate, (an excellent one, from the brethren at Otter Creek,) to the congregation, and have his name enrolled amongst us. It was done; but we never enjoyed his presence in the church. He was called to the general assembly and church of the first born, whose names are written in heaven. That we may all meet our sufferings and death with as much fortitude, calmness, and hope, is the sincere prayer of your affectionate brother, CYRUS McNEELY.

Departed this life on the 22d July, 1840, brother L. O'Oonner, aged 77 years, of Euclid, Ohio. He bore a long illness with Christian fortitude, and died as he had lived—in the hope of immortality.

MIND THE GOLDEN RULE!

To the Editors of the "Western Christian Advocate," "Conference Journal," *and the* "Lutheran Observer."

Gentlemen—You are in the habits of occasionally copying into your papers statements concerning myself and friends, our views and proceedings—such as Mr. Landis' false and calumnious representations of our doctrinal views and efforts, which are just as unfounded in fact as the slanders formerly propagated against your own Luther and Wesley. There is no tenet which I teach that I fear to defend before the world; but, gentlemen, to have put into my lips words which I never uttered, and to have ascribed to me sentiments, thoughts, and views which I abhor, is, you may judge by an easy application of the golden rule, not perfectly accordant with rational nature, divine, angelic, or human. If you have not noticed my own defences from those singular misconceptions, false and mistaken representations, (to call them by no harsher names,) I will send them to you again; and by all that is mainly, good, and Christian, I will request you to give your readers some chance to know that I do most sincerely and religiously disown, disavow, and abjure many of those views and errors ascribed to me in your periodicals. Surely you will not wilfully take up and publish an evil report against your neighbor, nor asperse my reputation by imputations as groundless as any ever urged against Prophet, Apostle, or Reformer, since the world began. Have you not seen that even the Biblical Repository itself, the fountain whence issued the calumnies of Landis, has *partially* admitted my defence? Will you allow the Calvinists to excell the Wesleyans and the Lutherans in fair play and good works—in justice and common sense fair dealing?

I send you herewith my defence against Landis, and you have access doubtless to the Biblical Repository. Do, then, treat me as you yourselves would wish to be treated in a similar case.

Respectfully and benevolently, your friend,

A. CAMPBELL.

October 1st, 1840.

HERETIC DETECTOR.

Brother *Crihfield* has taken into copartnery with him our very estimable and promising young brother *J. B. Ferguson.* The fact is noticed in the following words in a late Prospectus, for which we have not due space at present:—"As his subscription list had considerably increased, and the editorial labors multiplied with the advance of the work, it was thought advisable to the senior Editor to associate with himself Jesse B. Ferguson, already favorably known to our readers, as a co-editor and co-laberer in the work. For this purpose he has taken an interest in this office, and hereafter will be known as an Editor and joint laborer. From this arrangement our patrons may confidently anticipate that our paper will increase in interest and usefulness, as both the Editors will devote most of their time and what humble talents they possess, to getting it up in a manner and style corresponding with the object they have in view." ☞ Terms per volume, or per *annum*, $1,00 in advance. Address *Arthur Crihfield*, Logan county, Ohio. A. C.

HARNEY'S ALGEBRA.

An Algebra upon the inductive method of instruction—By JOHN H. HARNEY, A. M., *Professor of Mathematics in Louisville College.* Morton & Griswold, publishers, 1840.

The rapid progress which the study of the Mathematics has made among us within the last few years, is creditable to our country. We remember well when Algebra was rarely studied beyond the walls of our Colleges and the Military Academy at West Point. One reason of this, and perhaps the principal one, was the fact that the only text-books of that science to be found in the English language, were nearly as obscure as the works of the Alchemists. Day's Algebra, the first work of the kind that appeared in the United States, was a decided improvement, and gave a new impulse to the study of that science; yet who at that period would dared to predict that Algebra would yet become so simplified as to be within the comprehension of a child?

This object Harney's Algebra is well calculated to effect. We have no hesitation in saying, that with the aid of this treatise, any youth of ordinary capacity, with very little assistance from a teacher, can easily master all the difficulties of this invaluable science. In fact, by following the inductive method of Mr Harney, the student will hardly encounter a single obstacle. Among all the works designed to teach Algebra, we know of none so well adapted for the instruction of that class of students for which it is designed, as that of Mr. Harney. It needs not the gift of prophecy to predict that it will shortly become one of the most popular school-books yet published in the West Like every thing else that is published by the enterprizing firm of Morton & Griswold, the work is neatly and correctly printed, and we hope it will soon be found in every book-store in the West.

J. M. PECK.

So far as an examination of 108 pages of the above treatise is data from which to appreciate the whole, I heartily concur with the above commendation of it to public favor. We intend, should it all correspond with the portion examined, to make it a standard work in our College, believing it to be admirably adapted to beginners, as well as to those who have made some proficiency in the science. A. C.

ERRATA.

In the September *M. H.*, in line 31 from the top of page 423, the word 'eighty' is put before *one;* and in line 33 from the top of same page the same word 'eighty' is put before *three.* in such a manner as to make me report that 81 were reclaimed at the Rocky Narrows Church, and 83 reclaimed at the Antioch Church, instead of *one* reclaimed and *three* reclaimed, as were the facts of the case. A. G. EWING.

☞ Always willing to co-operate with and assist those who faithfully and successfully preach the cause of eternal truth and life, I promise myself the pleasure of visiting the brethren in Monroe county either this Fall or early in the Spring. A C.

☞ Sundry communications deferred.

THE

MILLENNIAL HARBINGER.

NEW SERIES.

VOLUME IV.——NUMBER XII.

BETHANY, VA. *DECEMBER*, 1840.

A SIN AGAINST ORTHODOXY.

I HAVE, it would appear, committed an unpardonable sin against Madame Orthodoxy and her numerous progeny. I have said that Orthodoxy is not Christianity in theory or practice. I have alleged that she is naturally and necessarily schismatical and demoralizing; that she is now, and always has been, more or less intolerant, proscriptive, and persecuting. I have solemnly affirmed my conviction that the church of Christ will never be one—that the gospel will never regain its power—that salvation will never be proclaimed to the ends of the earth, till *the Bible* be substituted for orthodoxy; *facts* for definitions; *things* for words; *faith* for speculations; *unity of faith* for unity of opinion; the *positive commandments of God* for human legislation and traditions; *piety* for ceremony; *morality* for partizan zeal; the *practice of religion* for contention about it. Such is the head and front of my offence against queer orthodoxy and her subjects.

By way of reprisals or of vengeance she has assembled and subsidized all her votaries to calumniate, misrepresent, and asperse my views and efforts. The orthodox Papist, Protestant, and Dissenters, stand side by side in the ranks of proscription and verbal persecution. They stand to their arms against the man that affectionately and honestly remonstrates against their schismatical tenets and practices; and though once all heterodox with each other, they have, in virtue of their worldly respectability, been constrained to acknowledge each other as heirs in common of the rights, immunities, and honors of Mother Orthodoxy.

True, indeed, I bear the *same testimony* against rival *heterodoxy*. But I am told that he is not a real substantive and distinct personal existence; that she that is called orthodoxy was in her non-age denominated heterodoxy. For example, Trinitarianism and Arianism;

or as they were more usually styled *Athanasianism* and *Arianism*, were alternately orthodox and heterodox, as they respectively gained or lost public favor. Councils and Emperors made sometimes the one and then the other mount the throne. Constantine and his Nicene Council secularized Trinitarianism, and inscribed upon its mitre, "Holiness to the Lord." Thus she became orthodox, and her rival Arianism became heterodox. But Constantius, his son, dethroned *homousios*, the symbol of orthodoxy, and enthroned its rival *homoiousios*, formerly the sign of heterodoxy. Thus what was orthodox in the Court of Constantine was heterodox in the Court of Constantius his son. Now the Arian idol wore Orthodoxy upon its brow, and fed its worshippers at the table of imperial munificence. Julian, his successor, laughed at both, and flattered neither. Jovian, however, restored Trinitarianism to orthodox honors. While the two brother Emperors, Valentinian and Valens, espoused opposite sides—the former swearing that Athanasianism was the true orthodoxy, placed it upon the throne of the East; while the latter preferring Arianism as his idol, placed it upon the throne of the West of the Roman Empire. Thus Orthodoxy at Rome was heterodoxy at Constantinople, and *vice versa*. But, soon after, the Bishop of Rome became infallible, and the Trinity of Athanasius was nailed to the mast of the Western Church; while Arianism in various forms reigned in the robes of imperial favor all over Africa and the East.

But while Heterodoxy and Orthodoxy are the names of the different fortunes of tenets and observances, rather than the representatives of the nature and moral character of those tenets and practices, it must be remarked that the changing of the style seems always to change the spirit of the system. Hence while Heterodoxy is always proscribed and persecuted, Orthodoxy uniformly proscribes and persecutes its antagonist. This is a point worthy of illustration and proof. We shall, then, first prove and afterwards illustrate this position.

It has already been stated that the gaining of public favor, like a charm, instantly transmutes and transforms Heterodoxy into Orthodoxy. And now we affirm a proposition not much less paradoxical—that when Heterodoxy becomes Orthodoxy, instantly a new spirit enters it, and its first breathings are anathemas, fines, imprisonment, exile, or death, in some form, to its rival.

The pages of all history, sacred and ecclesiastical, attest that Orthodoxy, whether Trinitarian or Antitrinitarian, Papal, Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Congregational, or Methodistic, as occasion serves, has ever evinced the same tyrannical, denunciatory, and persecuting spirit. The history of the church is, indeed, little else but the history of re-

formations and apostacies—of the conflicting wars and tumults of rival tenets—always orthodox while in power, always heterodox while out of power. Not only the history of the church, but the history of man holds up the same lesson to all who will be at pains to read it.—We shall begin with the Jews.

When the religion of Moses was corrupted into *Judaism* by the doctrines and commandments of men superadded to the word of God, or intermixed with it, we read its character in both Testaments. The ancient Prophets who preached the primitive faith of Moses, and remonstrated against the apostacy of kings and their courts—of priests and their people—the Saviour of the world—the twelve Apostles of the Lamb, and their genuine converts are enrolled amongst the dark and horrible trophies of this blood-thirsty demon, while arraying itself in the sanctimonious garb of sound tenets and orthodox doctrines, and seeking to subdue the conscience, and understanding, and the persons of men to its haughty and tyrannical dictation.

Do we read the history of Pagan Rome in the days of her greatness, while philosophy, science, and politics were at their zenith, and while the humble advocates of the Cross were proclaiming the new religion of life and immortality through the admirable and adorable name of Jesus of Nazareth? It is then we see philosophy, empty and deceitful philosophy, atheism, scepticism, and infidelity in the persons of Nero, Domitian, Trajan, the pious Antonine, Severus, Maximinus, Decius, Valerian, Aurelian, Diocletian, and others following each other for more than ten centuries in one diabolical system of proscription and persecution against the innocent and unoffending followers of the Prince of Life and Peace. Covered with the skins of wild beasts, torn in pieces by devouring dogs, placed on racks, scourged, tortured, and tormented in a thousand ways, or wrapped in pitch and sulphurous garments converted into torches, made to illumine the city of the Cesars, three millions of Christians appeased the bloody Moloch of Roman philosophy, moderation, and zeal for hereditary orthodoxy.

And wherein has Papal Rome excelled! Need we summon from the shades of the middle ages the martyred multitudes of the Cathari and the variously denominated reformers that have in different countries lifted up their voice for the dethroned Apostles of the Lamb? or need we tell of the "Invincible Armada," "The Holy Inquisition," the long protracted wars against the Protestants since the era of Reformation, which filled Poland, Lithuania, Hungary, Holland, France, Spain, England, Scotland and Ireland with rivers of innocent blood—in demonstration that Papal Rome is as persecuting and cruel as Pagan Rome!

Baptism or banishment, Popery or massacre were the kind alternatives of the minions of His Holiness, while seeking to convert Indians and Musselmen to the "Holy Apostolic Church of Rome." Renunciation of tenets and homage to imperial pontiffs were the conditions of salvation tendered to heretics and non-conformists—Waldenses, Protestants, and Dissenters. Spanish America and her fifteen millions of Indians; Europe with her forty millions of the faithful, sacrificed to the genius of Papal Orthodoxy, tell the horrid tale of Papal arrogancy wearing the civil sword and seated on an imperial throne.

And what the annals of Protestant Orthodoxy! If they be not so full of terror—so replete with exile, confiscation, and massacre, is it because her power has been more restricted, her reign shorter, her course less splendid, or because her genius is more benevolent, forbearing, and Christian than that of her rivals? Without an effort casuistically to decide the peculiar genius of this or that, the force of the restraints thrown in her way, or which of them has been most availing, it must suffice to say, that her annals are stained with the blood of martyrs, and that confiscation, exile, and death marked her triumphs soon as she mounted the throne of political dominion.

English history from the days of Henry VIII. demonstrates that Protestant Orthodoxy can imitate Papal Orthodoxy when her honor or her interests demand the sacrifice. Henry himself had learned to burn heretics while at school. And the names of Bilney, Bayman, and a multitude of other reformers, proclaim that Henry knew that fire would consume a heretic, whether Papist or Protestant. The "bloody Mary" had some excuse for the Hoopers, the Rogers's, the Taylors, the Bradfords, the Ridleys, and the Latimers that she burnt. Elizabeth, too, followed the example, not only in enacting sanguinary and persecuting laws, but in trying whether Baptists or Brownists could best quench the violence of fire. James I., also, the pious author of our excellent translation, commanded all Protestants, on pain of banishment or other punishments, to conform to the rites and ceremonies of the Papistical Protestant Church of Queen Elizabeth. Not only the fines, imprisonments, and banishments of the Star Chamber; the degradation and exile of hundreds of ministers; but the fires of Lichfield and Smithfield demonstrate that this orthodox sovereign believed in all manner of persecution as necessary for the souls and bodies of men, without reading Beza's treatise on the rights and uses of burning heretics, always vouchsafed to Christ's church. I need not call from the shades of oblivion the cruel deeds of the tyrant Laud in the reign of Charles I. Enough appears against English Episcopacy to prove that she is a daughter of the Papal Orthodoxy and recognize

the value of the Bastile, the sword, and the fire in sustaining her views of toleration.

But has her younger sister Presbyterianism, in the short period of her reign, given evidence that her orthodoxy is not in accordance with this same genius of secular religion! She lifts up her voice like a trumpet in attestation of the melancholy fact that her system is no exception to the presiding genius of all secular religious institutions. When in England for a short season she gained the throne, how did she demean herself? In 1645 her ordinance of toleration subjected all who either preached or wrote against the Presbyterian directory for public worship, to the reasonable fine of fifty pounds sterling; and for using the book of common prayer, even in a private family, the third time, she only doomed the transgressor to one year's imprisonment. The Parliament, indeed, once refused her petition to ordain uniformity, and to "extirpate popery, prelacy, heresy, and schism from the realm;" but in 1648 she carried with her the Parliament, and then came the bloody decree that "any one who maintained, published, or defended *five* certain errors, or any of them, *should suffer death.*" By the "Act of Conformity" during the reign of Charles II. in a single day she ejected from their livings two thousand pious and conscientious ministers. "The Conventicle Act" and the "Oxford Act" imprisoned and impoverished some eight thousand conscientious persons, besides kindly helping some of them to heaven by a shorter journey, because they differed from the Presbyterians on the word *orthodoxy*. In the more severe climate of New England the Congregationalists advanced no farther than to fine, imprison, whip, or banish for the good of their souls a few heterodox Quakers, Baptists, and others with them.

But the times are changed. The English nation has been humanized, softened, and moderated by the pens of John Locke, John Owen, and John Milton, on Toleration and the Rights of Conscience. Orthodoxy in England and in the United States is now almost toothless, and has little appetite for the victims of Heterodoxy. The dregs of her most bitter cup are only the wormwood and gall of ecclesiastic curses, anathemas, slanders, suppressions, perversions, backbitings, &c. Sceptics, Atheists, and Free Thinkers of all schools of infidelity, have also left off persecution. A political paralysis has suddenly seized the arm of ecclesiastic pride; the sword has fallen from its hand, and a more enlightened public opinion indicates that the spirit of the age is essentially more mild, pacific, and tolerant. Still the genius of Sectarianism is proscriptive, condemnatory, and denouncing; and those who oppose it are subjected to the constant annoyance of its artillery—

composed, indeed, chiefly of the missiles of misrepresentations, perversions, and inuendoes.

To afford an instance in our own case, it may be truthfully spoken that every odious heresy is now and then charged upon us. *The Biblical Repository*, *The Lutheran Observer*, *The Western Christian Advocate*, *The Conference Journal*, &c. &c. are occasionally placing upon their *columns* and in their *lines* the most barefaced falsehoods, suppressions, perversions, and caricatures of our views and sentiments. Even no less an author than *John Pye Smith*, D.D. F. G. S., Divinity Tutor in the Protestant Dissenting College, at Homerton, England, in his late work on Scripture and Geology, has, on page 214, positively affirmed that "there are some unhappy people in our own times who maintain that God is really a being having the shape, limbs, and functions of a man, the disciples of an Irishman, Alexander Campbell, an emigrant to Virginia." Yes, and refers his reader for proof to the Biblical Repository for January and April, 1839.—Now it is, I presume, wholly unnecessary for me to say to any one of my readers that a more unfounded falsehood was never published against any people, Jews or Gentiles, than the above. How any one in England or in America, professing to be a teacher of divinity, a commentator on the ninth commandment, hazards such a declaration, is to be explained only upon the principle that the genius of Sectarianism is necessarily falsifying, detracting, and calumniating. I think that even Landis himself is transcended in this baseless imputation. But such is the good fortune of all who say of Sectarianism that it is from beneath, and not from above. It was because our Divine Master said of the schismatically speculative and politically religious world then existing, that its deeds were evil, that it hated him. And such has been the honorable fortune of all that have honestly attempted to preach the same cause in the respective ratios of their approximation to the pure fountain of heaven-descended truth. The higher they ascend towards the primitive and uncorrupted truth of Christ's gospel, the deeper they fall under the condemnation of the pseudo-religious world. But why this is so, is a secret to all who have not learned the true genius of human nature. And that I may be understood in this position, I must, in self-defence, offer a few remarks on what I here mean by the genius of human nature.

THE GENIUS OF HUMAN NATURE.

There is a common, deep, and dangerous error on the subject of Popery, which seems, with very few exceptions to pervade all Protestant Christendom. It is a mistake of the genius of human nature for the genius of a particular religious institution. Protestants speak

of the spirit of Popery as an intolerant and persecuting spirit, as very different from the spirit of their own institutions, which they imagine to be wholly mild, pacific, and forbearing. But neither philosophy nor history sanctions or sustains this assumption—so far at least as pertains to the genius of Protestantism. They do award to Protestantism less of the rancor and virulence of persecution, but do not divest it, in any of its forms by law established, of a denunciatory and maledictory spirit.

All religious systems, one only excepted, more or less furnish not only favorable occasions, but strong incentives to rouse into action the latent genius of human nature under the name of a partizan spirit. And what is this genius of human nature but a selfish, proud, aspiring spirit? Therefore necessarily intolerant, proscriptive, and denunciatory. Now as all human systems of religion originate from this spirit, they all more or less make provision for the development and gratification of it. There is in all of them more or less affinity with this genius of human nature, frequently styled the pride of the human heart. But some of them are much more congenial with it than others. The Pagan and the Papal systems are, of all others, the most favorable to a full development and display of it, because they afford stronger inducements to the cultivation and exercise of it than any others.—While the Emperor of Rome was the High Priest of Paganism, and while the Pope of Rome is of right a temporal Prince, wearing a crown as well as a mitre, needs it the sagacity of a Solomon to discover, or the eloquence of an Apollos to show, that such a system will not only attach to itself all that is carnal, sensual, selfish, and demoniacal in man, but on proper occasions rouse them into action. Popery is, then, not so much the cause as the effect of this spirit, and it is preferred by carnal men whose education has been favorable to the system, because of its admirable adaptation to the genius of human nature in its present depraved and prostrate character.

Again—this native pride of the human heart, this peculiar genius of human nature, prompts every man to think more highly of himself, his powers, and performances, than he ought to think. Hence the strong tendency to self-righteousness in all natural religionists, and the great bustle about "getting religion" by our own expedients, discoverable on so many occasions. This imaginary superiority lays the foundation for both Calvinism and Arminianism in some of their more prominent dogmata, as they may happen to suit the differential peculiarities of men. The Arminian dislikes Calvinian election because it leaves him without merit in the hands of sovereign mercy; and the Calvinian hates Arminianism because it robs him of the pleasure of

thinking that he was the special object of sovereign favor from all eternity. The former is proud of something done *by* him: the latter, of something wrought *in* him. The Jews were as proud of their election to national honors as were the Greeks of their superior attainments in philosophy, science, and religion. All history, indeed, proclaims that a person may be as proud *of* something done *for* him, as of something done *by* him.

State religions are deprecated by Christians as much as by infidels, but from very different motives. The infidel opposes them, because they are in the way to his political aspirations; while the Christian repudiates them because they are in alliance with the corrupt genius of human nature, and tend not only to corrupt religion, but to acts of tyranny and persecution. In England an avowed infidel could obtain no office in the State, and an intelligent and consistent Christian could accept none in the established church. This is the reason why Christians and infidels agree in their opposition to State religions.

It matters not whether Orthodoxy or Heterodoxy become the creed in favor, when raised to the throne they equally attach to themselves the genius of human nature; and pride, intolerance, and persecution stand as sentinels around the throne. The only religion on earth that makes war against this spirit, is the pure original apostolic gospel of Christ. No one who has drunk deeply at that fountain can ever thirst for the objects of human ambition. And he that has not had his thirst slaked at this fountain, cannot but pant after the objects of human avarice or ambition. And if Cain slew his own brother when he suspected that he was to rise above him, it is not to be marvelled that Orthodoxy, whether Papal or Protestant, in alliance with the genius of human nature, will, to the utmost of its power, seek its own at the expense of the property, character, and life of him who dares to withstand its lofty pretensions, or to rebuke its insolent rapacity upon those who have courage to stand in the way of its unhallowed aspirations.

A. C.

MR. MEREDITH ON REMISSION.

THROUGH the politeness of brother Dr. HALL, of Louisville, we have been favored with the "Biblical Recorder and Southern Watchman," of the 1st August, containing the sequel of Mr. Meredith's views of baptism and remission; which we present to our readers with a few notes and comments:—

REMISSION AGAIN.

LAST week, it will be recollected, we published a letter from our brother Bradford of S. C., with only a part of our remarks in reply. The following is the concluding part of the aforesaid remarks. Should our

brother still see objections, we trust he will not fail to write us again. It is only by a free and candid expression of opinion, that we can hope to arrive at unanimity of sentiment on any subject.

On the subject of remission also our correspondent has misunderstood us. So far from agreeing with Mr. Campbell, in his exclusive notions of baptismal remission, we consider our article on the subject the most effectual refutation of his theory. It is such, in our view, because it concedes to him all that is true in his theory, and thereby deprives him of the benefit of that evidence which he has heretofore successfully pleaded in behalf of his whole scheme. That the scriptures have connected baptism and remission, in some sense, it is worse than useless to deny. We are aware that attempts have been made to destroy the force of the passages referred to; but always with such success as to betray the nakedness of the land, and at the same time to illustrate the deplorable effects of partizan prejudice.—On this point Mr. Campbell has always had the advantage of his opponents. He has triumphantly quoted such passages as Acts ii. 38., against which nothing has ever been offered better than a flimsy criticism, or a palpable perversion of apostolic teaching. [1.]

Here we have taken different ground from the rest of our brethren. We have promply conceded to Mr. Campbell every thing which candor seemed to demand. We have conceded that the Evangelists and Apostles, in the places referred to, meant what they said. We have conceded that, in a given sense, and under certain limitations, and for certain ends, remission has been connected with baptism. [2] But we have denied that part of Mr. Campbell's theory which places baptism on a footing with moral duties, which identifies it with regeneration, and which virtually renders it indispensable to salvation. [3.]

Note 1. This is candid and worthy of imitation, and I hope our Baptist brethren will be enlightened and admonished by it. "That there is a *connexion between baptism and remission is worse than useless to deny*," and "that nothing better than a flimsy criticism or a palpable perversion of apostolic teaching" has been offered against all those texts relied upon by us to exhibit that connexion between baptism and remission, is a declaration as honorable to Mr. Meredith as it is true in itself, and worthy of the serious consideration of the Baptist community.

Note 2. The above concessions contain all that we are anxious to maintain. "If the Evangelists and the Apostles meant what they said in the places referred to" for proof by us, we ask no more: for it was always "alleged by us that in a given sense, and under certain limitations, and for certain ends, that remission has been connected with baptism." We never went farther than this; our opponents said we did, but no man can show from our own language that we have ever transcended the words above quoted from Mr. Meredith.

Note 3. So do we deny that part of Mr. Campbell's theory which places baptism on a "footing with moral duties, and which identifies it with *regeneration*," in Mr. Meredith's acceptation of *regeneration*; and also that part of it which "virtually renders it indispensable to *salvation*," in Mr. Meredith's acceptation of *salvation*. Here the reader will observe that every thing depends upon the acceptation of the terms *regeneration* and *salvation*. If by *regeneration* Mr. Meredith means "a change of heart by the Spirit of God;" and if by *salvation* he means admission into heaven, there never was such a part of Mr. Campbell's theory, except in the brains of his opponents. And when Mr. Meredith reconsiders these misapprehensions I trust he will as candidly concede that my words have been grossly perverted, as he has that "nothing but flimsy criticisms and palpable perversions" have been opposed to the proofs of our views from the Apostles and Evangelists of Jesus Christ.

By so doing we have yielded all that can be made good by evidence; and have denied only that which is not only without proof, but which is plainly at variance with the general tenor of the inspired record.

It is not to be understood from the foregoing, however, that we have yielded this point to Mr. Campbell, merely as a measure of polemical expediency—merely for the sake of gaining a point in controversy. We trust we have been governed by higher motives. We have conceded this—nay, we have *insisted* on it, because we believed it to be true, because we considered it a part of divine legislation, and because we esteemed it highly necessary to a correct understanding of the rules and institutions of Christ's kingdom on earth. As before stated, while Mr. Campbell elevates the baptismal sacrament above its proper level, our brethren on the other side run as far into the opposite extreme. The truth, in our opinion, lies midway between these two excesses. [4.]

But our brother B. is mainly perplexed by what appears to him to be our contradictions. He understands us to say "that the sinner is forgiven when he believes—and yet he is not forgiven until he repents—and yet again he is not forgiven until he is baptized." Now, if our good brother will refer to what we have written, he will find that we have said no one of these. He will find that we have said that—"in the order of time, remission is connected with regeneration;" and that "just so soon as the sinner has been really regenerated, and thereby constituted a child of God, the blessing of remission is, *de facto*, his." He will also find that we have said, not that the sinner is forgiven, nor yet that he is not forgiven, when he believes—but that "remission has been *promised* to faith, and accordingly, that every true believer is duly forgiven." He will find also that we have said, not that the sinner is not forgiven until he is baptized, nor yet that he is forgiven when he is baptized, but that forgiveness has been *promised* to baptism, and accordingly that baptism is necessary to complete the conditions of gospel remission. [5.]

Mr. Meredith teaches that both a change of heart and baptism are essential to a Christian according to the New Testament; or, in other words, that no one was after Pentecost regarded as a saved person whose heart had not been changed by the Spirit of God, and whose person had not been immersed into water. So I teach. But that no person could, *in any case*, since Pentecost enter heaven without baptism, is no proposition of mine, and never was. There is, then, no such part of the true A. Campbell's theory as Mr. Meredith alleges—who that Mr. Campbell is who teaches the theory he repudiates I know not: I do not identify nor sympathize with him. I presume he is a ghost, a disembodied spirit, sometimes seen in the dark, but never in daylight!

Note 4. When my summit level elevation of baptism is considered, I am persuaded Mr. Meredith agrees with me. It is this: *The person that knows that immersion is commanded by Christ, and wilfully disobeys or neglects it, cannot be saved.* Higher than this A. Campbell never ascended; and if the Baptists stand below this elevation, I do assure them that, in my judgment, the truth lies not between them and us. They preach another gospel than that of Peter and Paul, and I never wish to be regarded as fraternizing with them at all in their views of the meaning of baptism. I can bring a peerless host of witnesses to prove that my summit elevation of baptism has been recognized by the most learned, intelligent, and pious Christians in all ages, as the true place which it occupies in the Christian institution, and I would not lower it one inch for the approbation of all the Baptists that have lived since the days of John Bunyan till now. Touching the terms *regeneration* and *salvation* we shall offer a few remarks at the close.

Note 5. It will require a mouthful or two of Dugald Stewart's metaphysics to interpret

The facts of the case are supposed to be these:—So soon as the sinner is truly regenerated, and thereby becomes a child of God, his sins are, in fact, forgiven. Still, however, the promise is not to regeneration, but to faith. Why? Not because the sinner is not forgiven until he believes, but because, as it seems to us, faith is the primary inward act and exercise of the new creature, and thereby becomes the appropriate evidence of a new state. Hence the promise of remission and every other similar blessing is made to faith. The idea is, not that the sinner is not forgiven until he believes, but that, as no one who does not believe can have adequate evidence of regeneration, none but the believer can claim the promise.

Substantially the same things may be said of baptism. Remission has been *promised* to baptism. And why? Not because the sinner is forgiven until he is baptized; but because baptism is the primary outward act of the new creature, and thereby becomes the appropriate outward evidence of an inward renewal or change of heart. The meaning is, not that the sinner is not forgiven until his baptism; but that, as faith is the appropriate inward evidence of regeneration, and as baptism is the appropriate outward evidence of faith; therefore no one is at liberty, except in extraordinary cases, to claim the blessing of forgiveness, nor any other blessing of the new covenant, without baptism. [6.]

We suspect that some of our readers have misunderstood us on the foregoing topic, in consequence of not having paid sufficient attention

and reconcile all that Mr. M. has affirmed in his paragraph of six periods. If the term *regeneration* denotes a change of heart by the Holy Spirit, as I think Mr. M. teaches, antecedent to faith, repentance, and baptism; and if "in the order of time remission is connected with regeneration," then it cannot, in order of time, be connected with faith, repentance, or baptism, as he afterwards affirms. This is the *pons asinum* of metaphysical theology. No one has ever crossed this bridge but in a chariot drawn by an aerial team I have been combatting for many years, and I think, modestly speaking, with some success, the phantom of regeneration antecedent to faith by *the Spirit*, without the word, until I think that even Mr. Meredith himself has been shaken somewhat, as the last paragraph in this essay clearly indicates: for he says, "We have spoken of regeneration and faith as successive events in the same *process*." I remember the time when he pounced upon the word "*process*" in reference to regeneration; but then *I* used it—now *he* uses it; and therefore regeneration and faith are successive events in the same process. The first *event* is regeneration; the second event is faith; the third, of course, repentance; the fourth, baptism; the fifth, forgiveness: for he says, "Baptism is necessary to complete the conditions of gospel remission" How, then, in reason's name, is "remission in order of time connected with regeneration!" Remission connected in time with the first and the fourth events in a successive series of events, is to me wholly unintelligible—unless, indeed, forgiveness is itself a *process*, and not an *act* of God's free grace! I earnestly request Mr. Meredith to throw a little light upon this dark subject.

Note 6. This is something of a new theory. Forgiveness in *fact* and forgiveness in *promise*. The regenerated are forgiven *in fact*, and forgiveness is still promised to their faith—of course future; for what is promised is not possessed! Then the *believer* is forgiven in promise and in fact too, and yet forgiveness is promised to his baptism!! The Baptists will have to erect as many colleges as churches before their members will all comprehend this new theory of remission. Remission to regeneration in fact—remission to faith in promise—and remission to baptism in promise! What I cannot comprehend I presume not to interpret. I leave this for Doctors of Divinity. We shall, however, just now examine Mr. Meredith's own explanation of it.

to our language. It will be observed that we have all along carefully discriminated between what takes place *de facto*, in deed and in truth, and what is merely *promised*, or affixed by stipulation to certain specified conditions. We have said that forgiveness is *in fact* connected with regeneration, but that it has been *promised* to faith and also to baptism. It will be observed also that we have discriminated between the *time* when the sinner is in fact forgiven, and the *time* when he has the appropriate evidence that such is the fact. We have said that the sinner is in fact forgiven when he is regenerated, but that he cannot possess the authorized and required evidence that such is the fact, until he has both believed and been baptized. It will be observed further, that we have discriminated between what is indispensable as a *moral* qualification, and what is indispensable as an outward act of compliance. We have said that faith is indispensable as a moral duty, and that baptism is indispensable as a positive requisition—that the former is necessary as the appointed bond of union between the sinner and Christ, and that the other is necessary as the appointed bond of union between the sinner and Christ's kingdom on earth.

We are still of the opinion that the illustration given in our former article on this point, sets the matter in a clear and conclusive light. Salvation, it will be admitted, has been promised respectively to faith, repentance, sanctification, justification, confession, perseverance, baptism, &c. But who ever understands from this that the sinner is not saved—that is, that he is not in the condition of a child of God, until after he has gone through the whole process? As our former remarks on this point are as lucid as any thing that we can now write, we will take the liberty to bring them again to the reader's notice. They are as follow:—

"The whole explanation required in the one case we believe to be this: Faith, repentance, sanctification, confession, perseverance, baptism, and good works, are successive, but not inseparable parts of the same process. What is predicated of one, may therefore with equal propriety be predicated of the rest. And hence the promise of salvation has been affixed to one or the other by the inspired writers, just as the occasion served, or as the point of inquiry demanded."

"The same principle of construction, as it appears to us, will solve all the supposed difficulties in the case in hand. *Faith* and *baptism* are the two distinguishing compliances which the gospel demands of the sinner—the one inward, the other outward—the one spiritual, the other corporeal—the one moral, the other ceremonial—the one the bond of union by which the sinner is united to Christ, the other the bond by which he is united to Christ's kingdom on earth. Without the one, there can be no spiritual vitality; without the other, there can be no adequate manifestation of that vitality. Without the one, there can be no sort of union with Christ; without the other there can be no proper or authorized union with his people, his church, his ordinances, his name, his laws, or any of the institutions, provisions, distinctions, or immunities of his kingdom on earth."

Our correspondent's inquiry respecting the thief on the cross, demands a moment's attention. This man was undoubtedly forgiven. This we know because the Saviour said so; or because he at least said that which clearly implied it. But suppose the case had been

otherwise. Suppose the Saviour had said nothing on the subject. Suppose also that this man had survived for months and even years, and had lived and died in neglect of the order to be baptized—What evidence should we have had that he was forgiven? Beyond all question we should have had none—that is, none that was conclusive. On the contrary, the facts of the case would have been strongly adverse to the supposition that he was either forgiven or renewed in heart.

The case of the thief is clearly an exception to the general rule. It proves, what all intelligent men must admit, that a man's obligations cannot exceed his abilities—that is, that where there is no power or opportunity to act in any given case, the demand is dispensed with. For this reason infants and idiots are not required to believe, though the general rule renders faith indispensable to salvation. For the same reason when it is clearly out of a man's power to submit to baptism, the obligation ceases. Still, however, this cannot affect the general rule in all cases where no such exception can be pleaded. We are accordingly authorized to say that he who neglects to be baptized, having the time and opportunity to comply with the divine appointment, leaves no properly authenticated evidence that he has been made a subject of divine acceptance. [7.]

Respecting the intimation of our correspondent, that we have been thought by some to be verging into Campbellism; or, as he might have said, that we have been directly charged by some with having gone over to Mr. Campbell, "horse, foot, and dragoons," we presume the whole has grown out of the inability of certain of our readers to see the difference between *conversion* and *regeneration;* and, because we have contended that the sinner is active in the exercise of faith, repentance, reformation, &c. &c., that we have therefore denied the existence of divine agency in regeneration. If we have failed to render ourselves intelligible on this point, the fault is undoubtedly to be attributed to ourselves. But if it be fact, as we believe it is, that we have expressed ourselves with all necessary care and perspicuity, then the responsibility must rest with those who have chosen to misunderstand and misrepresent us.

It will be observed that, for the sake of illustration, we have spoken of regeneration and faith as successive events in the same process. This, we presume, is true in theory, though in practice we should doubt the expediency of such distinction. It is about as difficult for us to conceive of regeneration without faith, as it is of faith antecedent to regeneration. The truth seems to be, that the one follows the other in such swift succession, that for all practical purposes it would be better to represent them as coetaneous. And this appears to be the light in which the subject is generally contemplated in the scripture.

REMARKS.

Mr. Meredith is at commendable pains to be understood by his brethren, and explains himself once and again on this mysterious

Note 7. To these three sentences we cheerfully record our full assent. Mr. Meredith then makes baptism an essential to salvation, future and eternal, as we do. And unless he can believe without authenticated evidence, himself being judge, he cannot believe that any one having knowledge of immersion, and *neglecting* it, can be saved. Farther than this we have never thought, spoken, or written.

subject. His words are, "The whole explanation required in the one case we believe to be this: Faith, repentance, sanctification, confession, perseverance, baptism, and good works, are successive, but inseparable parts of the same process. What is predicated of one may therefore with equal propriety be predicated of all the rest." That Mr. M. contemplates these terms, one and all, as representing parts of a great *process*, is farther evident from other passages in the article above quoted: such as—"Salvation, it will be admitted, has been promised respectively to faith, repentance, sanctification, justification, confession, perseverance, baptism," &c. "But who ever understands from this that the sinner is not saved," &c. "until he has gone through *the whole process*." Now so far from the terms regeneration, justification, sanctification, adoption, reconciliation, salvation, &c. being the names of parts of one great process, they are individually and severally representative of the entire change effected in the sinner; but contemplated only under one figure or one mode of existence. He is not first regenerated, then justified, then sanctified, then adopted, then reconciled, then saved. The Bible no where presents this view of the matter. Books on theology originated this style. But is the sinner contemplated under the figure of *one dead?* Then the correlate term represents the change: he is *quickened—made alive.* Is he contemplated as one *condemned?* The correlate is, He is *justified.* Is he regarded as one *unclean* or *polluted?* Then his change is represented by, He is *sanctified.* Does the Book speak of him as an *enemy?* Then is he *reconciled.* Of an *alien?* Then he is *adopted.* Of one that was *lost* and *perishing?* Then he is said to be *saved.* Thus Jesus Christ in one figure is a Lamb; under another, a Lion; under a third, a Shepherd; under another, a King, &c. &c. The people of God, too, under one figure are a Temple; under another, a Family; under another a Body, a kingdom, a Priesthood, &c. &c. To my mind it would not be more incongruous to picture out these as so many parts of one great institution, or the titles of Jesus as so many parts of a Saviour, than to speak of regeneration, confession, justification, sanctification, &c. &c. as so many parts of the grand redeeming process. When the kingdom or family of God was in the eye of the speaker, he denominated the change in reference to it under the figure of a birth, or being "*born again;*" when sinners were by Paul spoken of as enemies, their change is called *reconciliation;* when represented as dead in trespasses and sins, he speaks of them as *quickened*, &c. &c. These facts and observations, it appears to me, explain the whole subject of Mr. M 's explanation in a simple and intelligible manner, and delivers him from the difficulty in settling which of these, as parts of one great process,

is first, second, or third. Any one of these terms represents the salutary change from death to life fully and perfectly. To say a man is justified, regenerated, reconciled, converted, or saved, is the same in effect as to say them all of him, Mr. M. himself being judge. Why, then, mystify the affair by an attempt to make them merely parts of one great process, and to debate which of them is first, second, and third. A man that is regenerated is all the rest; and a man that is justified is all the rest; a man that is sanctified is all the rest. But, according to Mr. Wesley and some eminent reformers, a man may be justified in 1840, and sanctified in 1850. And according to some other eminent reformers, such as Andrew Fuller, a man might be regenerated in 1839, and believe in 1840: for, mark it well, Mr. Meredith, if regeneration can precede faith one moment, it may ten years; for on that principle it is independent of it. Now while I contend that states are formed or changed in a moment, I cheerfully admit that the character corresponding to these states may be the work of years. A man is justified, sanctified, adopted, &c. in a moment; but to be *righteous*, *holy*, and *just* in character, is not the effect of a single effort, nor of a short time. Paul to the Corinthians, says, "But you *are* washed, but you *are* justified, but you *are* sanctified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." Yet he exhorts the same persons to righteousness and holiness.

Faith and repentance are not the names of characters or states, and should not be mixed up with regeneration, conversion, reconciliation, &c. They are *principles* of action, causes or means of change of state and formation of character; but are neither the one nor the other. I wonder that a person of Mr. Meredith's discrimination could so jumble them up together. Faith, with me, is the vital and first principle of all true religion. Repentance, or a change of heart, follows in its train; then a change of state; then the formation of a new character; and the work is done. When I speak of a change of state, I contemplate the whole man, not a part of him. I teach, however, that a change of heart is a change of its state towards God; and without this change of heart a change of state and character is impossible.

The gospel believed, is, in the nature of things, antecedent to any and every gospel change in the heart and life of man. This is the great point in all the apostolic teaching. Hence the command, "Preach the gospel to every creature"—"He that believeth the gospel," &c. There is no regeneration, justification, or sanctification before this. It is *through*, not *before* faith, we are justified, and sanctified, and adopted. "We are," according to Paul, "the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ."

Regeneration before faith is as great a figment of human fancy as was ever dreamed. It is like salvation without faith. It supposes, first, that the Spirit of God works without means. It presumes, in the second place, that regeneration is only a part of salvation—an item in a process. And in the third place, it admits of the evangelical salvation of the heathen without the preaching of the gospel to them: for if regeneration is independent of faith—that is, antecedent to it in any case, it is, or may be, in all cases. Mr. Meredith I know writes of '*successive* and *inseparable* events;' but neither scripture nor philosophy, but system taught him that theory. Consequents are indeed inseparable from their antecedents; but this is taking for granted that regeneration is an antecedent, and faith a consequent—that faith is an effect, not the cause of regeneration. Now if the connexion between faith, repentance, baptism, justification, sanctification, &c. be that of cause and effect, then might he prove the first and infer the rest, and affirm that they are all successive and inseparable. But they are with him inseparable, not as cause and effect, but because it is presumed that if the Spirit regenerates a person he will cause him to believe—he will justify, sanctify, save him, &c. &c. The necessity of system, but not of philosophy, nor of the gospel, binds his antecedents and consequents—makes his regeneration and faith successive and inseparable. I know, indeed, that Mr. M. is neither original nor alone in this theory. He has some great names with him in it. But the age of great names has given place to the age of scripture and reason; and therefore I hope he will reconsider this part of his theory, and carry out what he has so clearly and independently begun.

I have from the first day in which I preached baptism for remission of sins, taught that, without previous faith and repentance, baptism availed nothing—that a man was virtually, or in heart, in the new covenant, and entitled to its blessings, when he believed and repented; but not formally nor in fact justified or forgiven till he put on Christ in baptism; that if by any insuperable or *involuntary* difficulty he could not be baptized, and were in the mean time to die, he would be *in heart* right with God, and would be accepted through the Beloved, although on earth he had not the testimony of God nor the testimony of man that he was forgiven and accepted through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. But if any man can show that this view and representation of the matter is either unscriptural or unsafe, I have no prejudice to overcome in renouncing it. But after a discussion of almost twenty years with all sorts of men, and after a more thorough examination of the scriptures of truth and all antiquity, I have only been confirmed more and more that such is the true evangelical economy now admin-

istered on earth. That some of my brethren, with too much ardor, through the force of strong feeling, and without all the premises before them, have transcended this view and these bounds, and given to baptism an undue eminence—a sort of pardon-procuring, rather than a pardon-certifying and enjoying efficacy, I frankly admit; but such has never been my reasonings nor my course. I appeal to my speeches in the McCalla Debate in proof of this; and these contain the first promulgation of these views in America, or any where else known to me in the present century. I am not responsible for the abuse of any principle of truth, and I am happy to see that there is now, as far as known to me, a very scriptural view of this institution generally prevalent through all our ranks, and fast pervading the Baptist and other religious communities both in the Old World and in the New.—All Christians pray for light to increase—for union, and harmony, and love to pervade the Christian profession; and I humbly thank the Father of lights and of mercies, that, in answer to the prayers of his people, many are now running to and fro and that knowledge has increased and is increasing. A. C.

METHODIST BAPTISM.

BROTHER CAMPBELL:

Sir—THE following extract is from the "*Western Christian Advocate*," published from Cincinnati. It is believed to be an editorial article. I am astounded with its contents. If the writer means what he says, and says what he means, I know not how he can be shielded from the imputation of having desecrated one of Heaven's holy ordinances. Hear him! Listen! Listen!!

"With all deference we suggest to our brother" [the editor of the Baptist Banner] "that among the things that tear and rend the body of Christ, and yet have nothing to do with the salvation and enjoyment of Christians, baptism is chief—and foremost. It is the mammoth apple of discord among us. It has a serpent's hiss, a serpent's bite, a serpent's venom, and ten serpents' lives. Will our brother help nine-tenths of the church, who see and deplore the mischief, to kill this royal reptile? Will he help to expel him from God's Eden, and blot out his memorials forever? *Will he help?* All we ask is, that he baptize in his way, and we in ours, as will answer our honest consciences." vol. 7, number 15, page 59.

1. "It tears and rends the body of Christ."—He should have said, 'The body of Methodism!' Baptism, as taught in the New Testament, is now causing human religious institutions to quake to their foundations!

2. "It has nothing to do with the salvation and enjoyment of Christians."—Why, then, did Christ say, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved"? And Paul, "So many of us as were baptized into Christ, were baptized into his death"—"and have put on Christ"? And why did Peter say, "The like figure (antitype) whereunto bap-

tism doth also now save us"! Why was all this said by the Holy Spirit, in reference to baptism and its effects, if it has nothing to do with the salvation and enjoyment of Christians? The writer must mean the salvation and enjoyment of Methodists? And even here he mistakes: for many Methodists put a high estimate upon baptism, and receive great enjoyment from it.

3. "It is the mammoth apple of discord among us."—Emphasize us, and we bow our assent. "Among us;" yes, but not among the primitive Christians. Who made it a mammoth apple of discord? Not God! not Christ! not the Apostles! The clergy!!—those who substituted pouring and sprinkling for baptism! Let them, then, look to it. Let them remember Nadab and Abihu, who, for offering strange fire upon God's altar, were themselves devoured with fire. Let them lay this home to their "honest consciences."

4. "It has a serpent's hiss."—Not when administered according to God's word. It may, however, hiss with deep, just, direful indignation when administered by those who nickname and abuse it; who represent immersion as being indecent; and who, when they can do no better, administer it! H. says it hisses, "and sure he ought to know"

5. "A serpent's bite."—Excruciating! And has it bitten Mr. H.? I'll venture it has! And has the effect of the bite turned the gentleman's brain? Most probably it has; for he further affirms that it has.

6. "A serpent's venom, and ten serpents lives."—Surely the head or the heart must be in fault here. I am startled—I am alarmed! What does H. mean? He has been publishing pieces recently to prove that you are tinctured with popery and infidelity. Will Mr. H. be so good as to inform us, in view of the above extract, with what he is tinctured?

7. "Will our brother help nine-tenths of the church, who see and deplore the mischief, to kill this royal reptile"?—It would seem that Mr. H. and his co-adjutors have been endeavoring to kill baptism; but having met with but little success, he has concluded that it possesses almost miraculous tenacity of life; and believing in his "honest conscience" that it is a "royal reptile"—a hissing, venomous, ten-lived serpent, he calls upon the editor of the Baptist Banner to help him kill it!—"to expel it from God's Eden, and blot out its memorials from the earth." To your tents, O Israel! Men, brethren, and fathers, help! Ah! sirs, baptism is a blood-sealed ordinance. Take heed lest ye be found fighting against God.

8. "All we ask is, that he baptize in his way, and we in ours, as will answer our honest consciences."—"That he baptize in his way, and we in ours." Here is the root of the evil. Men must have their *own way* in religion. The *Lord's way* does not suit them. Baptism must therefore give place to the "mourner's bench" and the "anxious seat," and the "word of reconciliation" must give way to *modern terms of peace*. "Our way" is the supreme idol. God have mercy upon the people, and save them from this mammoth delusion! God requires *truth* as well as sincerity, Josh. xxiv. 14; truth as well as spirit, John iv. 24; Godly sincerity, 2 Cor. i. 12. An honest conscience is not enough. Paul had that before he was converted. And says Christ, "The time will come when every one that killeth you will think he doeth God service"—will have an "*honest conscience*"!!!

INSPECTOR.

From the Christian Sentinel.

INSTANCES OF DILIGENCE IN READING THE SCRIPTURES.

"Read and revere the *sacred* page; a page
Which not the whole *creation* could produce,
Which not the *conflagration* shall destroy."—*Young.*

Josephus testifies of his countrymen, that if asked concerning the laws of Moses, they could answer as readily as to their own names. The Bereans are commended for *searching* the Scriptures. Timothy knew the Scriptures from a child. Aquila and Priscilla were so well acquainted with them, that they were able to instruct the eloquent Apollos, and "expound unto him the way of the Lord more perfectly."

Erasmus, speaking of Jerome, says, "Who ever learned by heart *the whole Scripture*, or imbibed, or meditated upon it, as he did?' Tertullian, after his conversion, was engaged night and day in reading the Scriptures, and got much of them by heart.

The Emperor Theodosius wrote out the whole New Testament with his own hand, and read some part of it every day. Theodosius the Second, dedicated a great part of the night to the study of the Scriptures. George, Prince of Transylvania, read over the Bible twenty-seven times. Alphonsus, king of Arragon, read the Scriptures over, together with a large commentary, fourteen times.

The venerable Bede is said to have been a great reader of the Bible, and that with such affection, he often wept over it.

Bonaventure wrote out the Scriptures twice, and learned most of them by heart. Zuinglius wrote out St. Paul's epistles, and commited them to memory.

Cromwell, Earl of Essex, in his journey to and from Rome, learned all the New Testament by heart. Bishop Ridley thus attests his own practice, and the happy fruit of it:—"The walls and trees of my orchard, could they speak, would bear witness that there I learned by heart almost all the Epistles; of which study, although in time a greater part was lost, yet the sweet savor thereof, I trust, shall carry me to heaven"

Dr. George used to read fifteen chapters of the Scriptures every day; five in the morning, five after dinner, and five before he went to bed. Mr. Jeremiah Whitaker usually read all the Epistles in the Greek Testament twice every fortnight.

Joshua Barnes is said to have read a small pocket Bible, which he usually carried about him, a hundred and twenty times over. Mr. Roger Cotton read the whole Bible through twelve times in a year. The celebrated Witsius was able to recite almost any passage of Scripture in its proper language, together with its context; and the criticisms of the best commentators.

The learned Father Paul read over the Greek Testament with so much exactness, that, having accustomed himself to mark every word after he had fully weighed the import of it, he, by going often over it,

and observing what he had passed in a former reading, grew up to such ripeness, that every word in the New Testament was marked.

Sir Henry Wotton, after his customary public devotions, used to retire to his study, and there spend some hours in reading the Bible. The excellent Sir John Hartop, in like manner, amidst his other vocations, made the Book of God so much his study, that it lay before him night and day. James Bonnel, Esq., made the Holy Scriptures his constant and daily study; he read them, he meditated on them, he prayed over them. M. De Renty, a French nobleman, used to read daily three chapters of the Bible, with his head uncovered, and on his bended knees.

Lady Frances Hobart read the Psalms over twelve times every year; the New Testament thrice, and the other parts of the Old Testament once. Susannah, Countess of Suffolk, for the last seven years of her life, read the whole Bible over twice annually.

The celebrated John Locke, for fourteen or fifteen years, applied himself closely to the study of the Holy Scriptures, and employed the last period of his life scarcely in any thing else. He was never weary of admiring the grand views of that sacred book, and the just relations of all its parts. He every day made discoveries in it, which gave him fresh cause of admiration. And so earnest was he for the comfort of his friends, and the diffusion of sacred knowledge amongst them, that even the day before he died he particularly exhorted all about him to read the *Holy Scriptures*. His well known recommendation to a person who asked him which was the shortest and surest way for a young gentleman to attain to the true knowledge of the Christian religion, in the full and just extent of it, was—"Let him study the Holy Scriptures, especially the New Testament. Therein are contained the words of eternal life. It hath God for its author—Salvation for its end—and Truth, without any mixture of error, for its matter"

The Rev. William Romaine studied nothing but the Bible for the last thirty or forty years of his life. A poor prisoner, being confined in a dark dungeon, was never indulged with a light, except for a short time when his food was brought him, he used to take his Bible and read a chapter, saying he could find his mouth in the dark, when he could not read. Henry Willis, farmer, aged 81, devoted almost every hour that could be spared from his labor, during the course of so long a life, to the devout and serious perusal of the Holy Scriptures. He had read, with the most minute attention, all the books of the Old and New Testament eight times over; and had proceeded as far as the book of Job in his ninth reading, when his meditations were terminated by death.

It has been the regret of several eminent men at the close of life, that they had not studied the Scriptures with greater assiduity. Salmasius, who was one of the most consummate scholars of his time, saw cause to exclaim bitterly against himself—"Oh!" said he, "I have lost a world of time! Time, the most precious thing in the world! Had I but one year more, it should be spent in perusing David's Psalms and Paul's Epistles! Oh! sirs," said he to those about him, "*mind the world less, and God more.*"

FAMILY CULTURE.

CONVERSATIONS AT THE CARLTON HOUSE.

No. XII.

Olympas. Some of you said that there were some important points omitted in the ninth chapter. Who will mention them?

Thomas. The first six verses of the ninth chapter, so far as recollected by me, were passed by without much or any notice.

Olympas. Read them, Thomas.

[He reads them.]

Olympas. What are the points of importance here?

Reuben. There is the grant for flesh for food, which seems to be a new arrangement.

Olympas. Wherein does it, Thomas, appear to be new?

Thomas. Because allusion is in the grant to a former one—"As I have given you the vegetable, so now give I you the animal kingdom for food." So it would seem to read to me.

Olympas. I will now wait upon the second and third class for their voluntary remarks on this passage. You of the second class will therefore proceed with your own remarks and interrogatories.

William. I have seen the second verse fully accomplished on many occasions while travelling with my uncle through the wild woods where no person lived. God said to Noah that he would put the fear and dread of man upon all the beasts of the field, and upon every fowl of the air, and upon all reptiles. Hence when man appears they all flee. I have seen squirrels, wild turkeys, and various birds all assembled in one place, and familiarly sporting together; but when a man appeared among them they all fled. There is a reverence for man, a dread of his presence upon all animals, differing much from their fear of one another.

Mary. God, in bestowing flesh for food to man, did not allow him to eat the blood. Is it, therefore, still wrong for us to eat blood?

Edward. I should suppose it was, because this seems to have been a precept to the whole world; for as yet there was neither Jew nor Gentile, but one family included all human nature.

Eliza. I wonder what harm there is in eating blood, more than there is in eating flesh; or why it should be wrong to eat blood, and not wrong to eat the flesh formed out of it and nourished by it.

Olympas. A divine precept always settles what is right and what is wrong. The Doctor's say blood is unwholesome—a very indigestible substance. But this is not the reason given. *The life is the blood.*—

This was never known to naturalists till since Hunter's time; but God made it known to Moses long before. It would seem not only to be a prohibition of cruelty, but also to have some reference to the great fact that blood was given for an atonement, and to be in sacred use for expiation. But the fact that God prohibits blood is enough. The man that eats blood sins against the precept of God given to Father Noah for the benefit of all his children. Do you remember any allusion to this precept, or any similar prohibition in the New Testament, Eliza?

Eliza. The decrees passed at Jerusalem, on a reference from Antioch in Syria, forbid to the Gentile Christians blood, whether by itself or in animals strangled, having the blood in their bodies.

Olympas. This, then, is enough. Blood is forbidden the Jews, the Gentiles, and the Christians. Surely, then, we ought to abstain from it. It has often been observed that the eating of blood brutalizes those who are addicted to it; and certain it is that they are savages who drink it from the veins of animals. Still I opino that our heavenly Father, intending it for a most sacred and to us salutary use, enjoined an abstinence from it chiefly on this account.

William. There is yet a very obscure point in this context which I cannot understand. It is in the fifth and sixth verses.

Olympas. I have reserved these for the senior class. I ask the views of the senior class on this passage.

Reuben. The fifth verse begins with a solemn declaration that God would require the blood of human life from the hand of beasts.—Whether the Lord meant he would demand human blood for cruelty shown to beasts, or that he would not allow a beast to live that had ever killed any one, I am not confident. I refer this point to some of my class-mates.

Thomas Dilworth. Had not some preacher in my hearing strongly affirmed that this passage referred to all acts of cruelty to beasts—such as horse-racing, cock-fighting, and all manner of cruelty to brutes—I should not have found any difficulty in understanding it. To me it seems to indicate that God would require at the hand of every beast the blood which it shed. Of course it is human blood. By this phrase I would understand that he would allow any animal to be slain for slaying man. Nay, indeed, not only allow it to be slain, but he solemnly requires it to be slain.

Francis. While I accord with the preacher who says that all cruelty, oppression, and hard service imposed on animals, deserves the frowns of indignant Heaven; and while I believe that the man who for his pleasure, or even for his interest, abuses a horse, an ox, or a dog, will be charged with it in the day of judgment, if he repent not; especially

horse-racers, bull-baiters, and cock-fighters, I think this is fully taught in other places, and that here exclusive reference is had to shedding human blood.

Rufus. Truly, I think that he that said, "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox treading out the corn," will not hold that man guiltless who starves his horse, who overworks his ass, or wantonly torments any creature detrimental to his existence.

Mary. Mr. Cowper, on this subject, exactly expresses my idea, only more elegantly than I could have done it—

> "I would not place him on my list of friends,
> Though polish'd with fine manners and good sense,
> Who heedlessly would tread upon a worm."

Olympas. I may conclude, then, that we all agree in the sentiment, while we repudiate this as the sense of the passage.

Thomas Dilworth. I think in this case, as in all others, the context helps us out of the difficulty. The preservation of human life from violence seems to be the mind of the Spirit in this connexion. It may read, "At the hand of every beast, and at the hand of man will I require the blood of your lives." Nay, farther he adds, "At the hand of *every man's brother* will I require the life of man."

Reuben. And this certainly is confirmed by the following unequivocal precept: "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." Does not this command some person to kill the man that has voluntarily killed his brother? And if man must die for killing man, surely a beast ought to die for the same deed, although incapable of reason, and therefore not a subject of moral law.

Rufus. But this would not simply allow, but constrain the punishment of murder by inflicting death in every case. And was this the law ever since the flood?

Francis. It was not the law before the flood; for Cain, the first murderer, who literally slew his own brother, was not put to death, although his blood called to heaven for vengeance? And is it the Christian law?

Olympas. Cain was not killed—civil government was not yet set up—nor, indeed, does it appear that civil government was instituted by any divine authority before the flood. And this may explain the reason why the earth was filled with violence, private vengeance, and retaliation. But in newly organizing human society after the flood, God early provided against the outrage of the antediluvian age by making it the duty of man to set up a magistracy, clothed with power of life and death.

Thomas. Are we, then, to understand that it is now the duty of the civil magistrate to punish murder with death, in consequence of a pre-

cept given to Noah? Is not the Old Testament done away by the New, and a better—that is, a milder, a Christian government set up? I read something about the *lex talionis*, the law of reprisals, and retaliation, as being contrary to the genius of Christianity. I would be glad to understand this matter.

Olympas. The scriptures called the "*Old Testament*," said to be done away, is that described by Paul which came from Mount Sinai in Arabia. That was the covenant of the Jewish peculiarities. It was an episode or digression from the patriarchal institution, and not being identified with it at its rise, or in its history, it could not be abolished with it. Some learned men have, indeed, confounded this precept with the law of Moses, and thus subjected it to the same abrogation. But this precept is older than Abraham by three hundred and fifty years, and older than Moses by more than seven centuries. *The precept is therefore as old and as universal as the present world.* The Jewish code had its cities of refuge for the innocent man-slayer and its death for the murderer, and various other regulations on this subject, But here is a precept of God antecedent to it, not confined by it, and as broad as the whole stream of human nature, and extending through all dispensations and generations of men, neither vacated nor abolished by law or gospel.

Reuben. Does not the Sermon on the Mount teach 'No longer eye for eye, tooth for tooth, stripe for stripe, burning for burning'?

Olympas. So it does; but that sermon was addressed not to civil governments, but to Christ's disciples. And what have Christians, as such, to do with putting men to death, or of sitting on civil judgment seats! There is no compulsion in Christ's kingdom—no prosecution of disciples of Christ by disciples before civil magistrates on any account known in the New Testament. It proves nothing here to admit that Christians are not to retaliate any injury whatever. The question is not what Christian or Jewish governments, but what *human* governments are to do. The text says, "He that sheddeth *man's* blood, by *man* shall his blood be shed." This is a positive statute of man's Creator; and if civil government be an ordinance of God, then the ministers of that government have sin upon them who disobey the precept which institutes all civil and political rule. For to what precept, if not to this, shall men look for civil authority of any sort! This precept has in the whole of civil government. In giving to man power over the life of man, as God's minister to execute wrath, power over the entire person and property of man is delegated, inasmuch as the greater always includes the less. God has sometime and somewhere given the sword to the civil magistrate. It is a real sword,

and not a picture of one, which the civil magistrate wears upon his thigh. It is a sword to shed the blood of him that has taken the life of man in deliberate wrath or malice. Now if God has given the sword, when and where did he do it, if not in the text before us? This, my young friends, is the true and primitive and divine institution of civil government which has to do with *man* as *man*—not with man as a Jew or a Christian; but I repeat it, with man *as man*. Those who would strip the magistrate of the sword, have mistaken God's precepts, and have aimed, without intending it, a mortal thrust at all civil government. When there is no world, but all church, we will need no jails, pillories, scaffolds, swords, or magistrates; but till then I plead for the civil magistracy and the civil sword for a terror to evil-doers, and for a praise to them that do well.

If God's precept was obeyed, and every duellist and murderer was promptly put to death as the Lord has commanded, many lives would be saved, and the world would stand in awe of the righteous judgment of God. But I fear there is much blood-guiltiness on the heads of this land for their winking at various forms of murder, and therefore disobeying a positive command of God—"*By man shall his blood be shed.*"

Rufus. Ought the civil sword of which you speak to be employed in shedding any other blood than that of the murderer? For example, ought the thief, the robber, the burglar, or the man guilty of arson, to suffer death?

Olympas. By no means: except in case of house-burning human life be not taken. It is a disgrace to the intelligence of England, that she values a man at five shillings! England is not half civilized on this point. That proverb is more than true in England, "A man had better be hanged for stealing a sheep than a lamb." In England a man had better be hanged for murdering a king than for stealing a guinea! This is her own teaching, not mine. She has it printed in her code—she has it published to the ends of the earth; inasmuch as she has one and the same sword for the petty thief and the monster who would kill his sovereign. She boasts of philanthropy, and sympathizes with the American Negro sold for 200 guineas, while she hangs her thousands per annum for stealing £1. 2s. and 9d., for forging 20s., or any other sum less than the price of a Virginia slave.

Francis. But the reason given for slaying the murderer, or for enforcing the precept, is to me somewhat mysterious. It is, "For in the image of God made he man."

Olympas. This speaks a volume. It is not in the spirit of retaliation nor of restitution that the murderer is slain. It is because he has pro-

faned the image of God by casting it to the ground. To kill a man wrongfully is to despise the image of God, and for this alone the malefactor deserves to die. No man therefore has a right to forgive murder. It is an offence which man cannot forgive; for it is more than the simple breach of a divine law: it is a marked contempt for the very person of the Lawgiver himself. It is a crime that caps the climax of human daring, and leaves a brand black as hell and deep as eternity on the face of him that perpetrates it. "No murderer can have eternal life abiding in him." The devil's worst character is, that he was a murderer—a duellist from the beginning.

My sons, be admonished by this lesson never to cherish an unkind feeling to any human being. It is dangerous to get angry with your brother. Cain's murder was the fruit of Cain's passion. Anger sleepeth only in the bosom of a fool. Let not the sun ever set upon your wrath, and it will never rise upon your guilt. Regard that class of murderers called "duellists" as unworthy of your company. Remember that however men in their folly may wink at their crimes, the broad stamp of Heaven's indignation is upon them, which nothing but the blood of Christ, accompanied by the purest tears of heartfelt sorrow that ever dimmed the vision of the sincere penitent, can wash away.—To appear before the tribunal of Christ with the blood of God's image resting upon one's conscience, is the most hideous and appalling thought that ever pierced with anguish the human heart. Remember the petition—"Lord, abandon us not to temptation, but deliver us from evil."

I had intended a few questions for Susan, James, and Henry, as well as for John who has been so long absent from home, but the time will not now admit. We have finished, I think, the first ten chapters of Genesis, and are now fairly up to the eleventh—to the building of Babel, and the confounding of human speech, which, after my return from the city, I intend to take up in order. Meantime, you will reconsider the past, and prepare for the sequel of Genesis. A. C.

LETTER FROM MR. BROADDUS.

Caroline, October 16, 1840.

My dear Sir,

In the August number of the Millennial Harbinger, in a notice of the "meeting at Charlottesville"—having incidentally referred to what you term "the Dover Decrees"—you close with the following sentence: "Will our much and sincerely esteemed brother Broaddus go to heaven and leave those decrees on record among the archives of

the Baptist denomination! If he do, brother Semple and he will have some strange talk about that ugly affair."

In the "Christian Publisher," too, for September, the Editors, I find, have invited my attention to the same subject.

Christian courtesy seems to require that I should not suffer these appeals—made in so friendly and respectful a manner—to pass off unnoticed—unresponded to, on my part. I may add, that personal regard concurs in this case with Christian courtesy, to induce me to the step which I now take in sending you these lines: and I request that my friends of the "Publisher" may consider my reply, addressed immediately to you, as a response also to their appeal.

Much as I may *feel* in regard to the matter thus brought to my notice, I do not seem to be prepared to *say* much; but what I *may* say, I desire may be in a frank and friendly spirit; and in such a spirit I trust it will be received on your part.

You load me, my dear sir, with too great a share of responsibility, in regard to the continued operation of the "Dover Decree." I *could not*, by any influence which I may wield, have the decision of the Association rescinded, if I *would;* albeit, I do not say—nor *can* I say, all circumstances considered, that I *would* if I *could;* and herein I bespeak your forbearance and your candor.

In regard to the action of the Association—the "decree" which produced the separation, I must say, in all candor, that, as matters stood, I then thought, and still think, it was the only eligible step that could be taken. The spirit and language of the instrument which was drafted on that occasion, did not meet my approbation. It has since been somewhat modified; though it is still, in my view, exceptionable; but the issue which took place seemed to be really *necessary*. With the views which we cherished, on the one hand, and with those which appeared to be entertained by "the reformers," on the other hand—no other alternative presented itself, than continual internal *conflict*, or *separation*: and we chose the latter.

This, however, furnishes no reason for an everlasting separation. If we have erroneously construed your views, and in our zeal for the great truths of the gospel, have wrongfully put you under the "ban of the empire;" or if you in your zeal for exploding long cherished errors, have incautiously struck at important truths;—or if there should have been on both sides something erroneous;—something of misconstruction on the one hand and rashness on the other;—why, for aught I can see, there might yet be hope of reconciliation and union. And a union on a firm scriptural basis, none would greet more cordially than myself.

Of late, I am free to say—(I mean, for some several years past) while I have seen in the "Harbinger" much to approve, I have met with nothing for which my fellowship in the gospel would be forfeited. I cannot say the same of some things which you have put forth in former times; and a retraction of such things would, in my estimation, be proper and necessary. I regret, my dear sir, that you should be separated from us; and much should I rejoice on seeing your talents enlisted in the one great cause. That the church needs a progressive reformation, I have no doubt; and to all efforts for this object, on a scriptural basis, I would say, "God speed!"

Before I conclude I have another remark to offer. There must be some truths which are vital and fundamental. Among these you and I both reckon that great truth, *atonement or expiation by the blood of Christ.* Now I find in your discussion with a venerable correspondent, you have to remind him (M. H. for October, page 472, 473,) that he has forgotten to state this among the designs of the death of Christ!!! How could we recognize members—not to say *ministers*, who leave out of their building this corner stone? *Verbum sat.*

Yours in the blessed hope,

ANDREW BROADDUS.

THE EDITOR'S RESPONSE TO MR. BROADDUS.

BROTHER BROADDUS:

My dear Sir—I THANKFULLY and cordially reciprocate every good feeling expressed in your letter before me; and shall endeavor, with similar frankness, candor, and courtesy, to respond to it. Charged, as I have sometimes been, with the desire of making a new party, I am glad, on every retrospection of my course and of the opposition offered to it, that neither friend nor foe has been able to adduce a single fact indicative of such a wish on my part. On the contrary, whenever the history of this effort at reformation shall have been faithfully written, it will appear, we think, bright as the sun, that our career has been marked with a spirit of forbearance, moderation, and love of union, with an unequivocal desire for preserving the integrity, harmony, and co-operation of all who teach one faith, one Lord, and one immersion.

In confirmation of this fact I am happy to add that no Baptist of good character for piety and morality, has ever been, because of a diverse theory or opinion, excluded from our communion or communities. If divisions then exist, we presume the crime of making them will not lie upon us; unless the declaration of an opinion, the affirmation of a particular view, or the correction of an error in doctrine, discipline, or government, be tantamount to making a party. I may add, in farther corroboration of our anti-sectarian character and feelings now, that, under the blessing of Heaven, a very large party has been formed, in many regions equalling any other denomination; and in others, where we have had an equal ratio of preachers, surpassing them in number; we, as a denomination, are as desirous as ever to unite and co-operate with all Christians on the broad and vital principles of the New and everlasting Covenant.

But our views and objects have been mistaken and misconstrued by many of our Baptist brethren and friends; and amongst the melancholy monuments of it are the Dover Decrees, and similar acts of exclusion from other quarters. That our brethren may have been to blame for some indiscretions, as well as some unguarded expressions in giving

rise to these acts of exclusion and proscription, I am frank to admit. Indeed, the first of these anathemas, the Beaver Decree, in 1829, I have always believed was occasioned by some violent movements on the part of our brethren in the Western Reserve, Ohio, in the height of a great excitement. Extremes beget extremes, and when the ball of ultraism is put in motion there is no foretelling its destiny. Despite of all my efforts to the contrary, Dr. Noel and his Thirty-nine Articles went the rounds of the Franklin, South District, and Elkhorn Associations in Kentucky. These, together with the Beaver and Grand River anathemas, excited the Dover before we could obtain a calm, full, and candid hearing. After these proscriptions and anathemas it became more difficult to be understood than before. The Pastors had now to sustain themselves with their flocks. Exaggeration, discoloring, and alienations became the order of the day; and the war was carried on with a spirit and a zeal deserving of a better cause. But the leaders have died. The Noels, the Clacks, the Warders, the Wilsons, the Cloptines, the Jennings's, the M'Connicos, &c. &c. with your worthy, but, in this instance, too credulous colleague, Bishop Semple, have left the field of controversy; and Time, that great innovator and corrector of errors and false impressions, has given the people time to reflect and reconsider their sayings and doings. Meanwhile, the cause we plead has triumphantly advanced, and is now preached in all North America, the United States, the Canadas, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Texas, England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales. Our views and aims are now fully developed; and the consequence is, that the Baptist people and others wonder at themselves, and say that we have changed and are not so heterodox as formerly. They have heard with more candor; and, like the passengers approaching the shore, they regard us as nearing their prow and fast approximating to their views.—Well, this gives us pleasure, as it proves that had they understood us at first as at last, they would not have given us to the enemy.

The Dover Decrees, the subject now before us, were preceded by ot only those already mentioned, but by a council of seven or eight churches, and were not only preceded by, but based upon, the decrees of said council. If I mistake not, my dear sir, you were chairman of the committee raised by said churches, and of course sanctioned, if not drafted, said report. Now as the Dover Association in her decree only reinforced and sanctioned the decrees of the council, it will follow that if the decrees of the council are founded upon a mistake and misconstruction of our views, the Dover Decrees are based upon error and assumption. It was in this view of the case, in which, if mistaken, I shall thankfully be corrected; it was, I say, in this view of the case

that I called your attention to the subject. Now *not one* of the *four principles* expressed in what I once called "the Semple and Broaddus Decrees," and on which the Dover are based, is now, or ever was, a principle of ours; and by turning over to vol. ii. M. H. pp. 76–84, you will see that we cordially and fully disavowed them from the beginning.

Allow me to say, that, according to the opinion which I then entertained, and now entertain of Elder Semple and yourself, I do not think you could have sanctioned these measures had you not wholly misconceived our views and objects. And while I candidly avow this as my conviction I as frankly say, that, in my judgment, you owe it to yourself and our deceased friend, equally as to us, to consider this matter afresh, and if built on false assumptions as I allege, to have those decrees, if in your power, cancelled.

I think in the same spirit of candor which I would expect from you, it is due to you and the occasion to say, that I am willing to extenuate this affair by frankly admitting, and I do it most cheerfully, that some of our friends may have on some of those points expressed themselves unguardedly; and farther, that in the heat of discussion and in defending ourselves from so many allegations, we may have in word or writing, or perhaps in both, used terms and phrases of such ambiguous construction as to afford not merely a pretext for opposition, but a possibility for misunderstanding us. Allow me, then, to say, that those four principles on which the Council and the Association acted, were not then, nor now, our principles; and being now, and formerly disowned by us, I refer it to your candor and magnanimity whether you ought not at least to move a reconsideration of them, and give your vote against what we have always considered a calumny and unjust representation of our views.

That the Baptist society "needs a progressive reformation" I must, with you, cordially and benevolently avow as my opinion; and that we all ought to be up and doing, I as firmly believe. As to our views of reformation wherein they are founded in truth your people cannot resist them. They cannot keep them out of their churches. They will pervade all Christendom in this age of reading and discussion. If any of our views of reformation are not founded in truth, we wish to see them exploded, refuted, and put down. In no supposable event have we any thing to fear from intimacy with your churches or Pastors. Our errors we desire to lose, and our truth no man can take from us.

Could the friends of truth and union and the conversion of the world agree to meet on the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the

Bible, acknowledging one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one body of Christ, and one Spirit; could they leave the conscience free where God has left it free, and not bind their private opinions upon one another; and could they open their pulpits, their ears, their hearts to a free intercommunication of preachers and people, and occasionally celebrate the Christian festival together, and devote themselves more to the study of the Bible and to Christian holiness of life, what a blissful time we should soon have! What a prelude and pledge of a better state of things! They might gladly suffer the world to call them Christians, Disciples, Baptists, Reformers, as they pleased; they would have the peace, the joy, the feast within, and would advance on the bulwarks of Satan conquering and to conquer.

My dear sir, to be instrumental in a work so great and good, would certainly afford you much pleasure, and make your last days your best days. Permit me, then, to urge upon your attention the necessity of either annulling the decrees, or of showing that they are not founded upon assumptions at war with all that we have preached and with all that we have written on all the points to which they allude.

Your reference to vital and fundamental principles I approve. But with regard to that "venerable correspondent" of whom you speak, we must not judge too soon. I view it as an oversight, rather than an intentional omission, that he left out the expiatory designs of the Messiah's death. Men long addicted to speculative controversy on Trinitarian and Unitarian hypothesis, are sometimes scared past Mount Zion, Mount Calvary, and the Mount of Olives. Some good men shudder with horror at the idea of "placating an offended Deity," of "satisfying dishonored justice," of "reconciling an angry God," that they are afraid to use the words expiation, sin-offering, atonement, lest they should resemble the children of Ashdod. For my part, I am not so timid. I believe that that venerable correspondent will come out with a full declaration of faith *that Christ died for our sins*, according to the scriptures; and that "without the shedding of his blood" God could not in honor or in truth have forgiven one transgression. But let him have his own time and his own manner of communicating his conceptions.

To conclude, kind sir, from your knowledge of our real views and sentiments, would it not be expedient and honorable on your part to undeceive those good Baptists who are so prejudiced against us because of the four principles imputed to us, that they will join with the most bigoted and intolerant Paidobaptists, who cunningly, like Miller of Princeton, and Kurtze of Baltimore, and Landis of Pennsylvania, seek to defame us on other points, that our efforts in favor of believer's

immersion may not avail your society. I know these gentlemen so well as to understand what they are about. By good words and fair speeches they deceive the hearts of the simple. Meantime I am reviewing the late works of this new cohort of pleaders for infant aspersion. These are Miller, and Kurtze, and Beecher, and Hall, with several other fresh hands—three of them hot from the press, as rife as ever for the popish ceremony of infant sprinkling.

Meanwhile, my dear sir, with much affection and esteem, I remain in the good hope of eternal life, sincerely yours,

A. CAMPBELL.

HOW WE CHANGE!

THE following true anecdote illustrates how wonderfully we are changing from heterodoxy to orthodoxy. There are, if I can believe only the tithe of what I hear, very many who teach what we have written in one half of their sermon, and denounce us in the other. If they were honorable plagiarists we would never expose the cheat; but when they seek to destroy our reputation, and yet deal in our wares, and make merchandize of our labors, we will occasionally tell them of it. A. C.

PREJUDICE.

BETHESDA, VA., October, 1840.

Dear brother Campbell—As further evidence of the influence of a *name*, as also the power of *prejudice*, I will, with your permission, relate an anecdote which occurred not long since.

About two years ago a newspaper belonging to the Methodist connexion, and sustained by two Conferences of that denomination, and printed about fifty miles from this place, published several essays against what the writer was pleased to term "*Campbellism*," in which he endeavored to show that you and your friends "denied the influence of the Holy Spirit in the salvation of men."

Feeling confident that he was misrepresenting your views, and believing he was doing so ignorantly, I took a copy of your "Christian Baptist" from my shelf and examined your essays on that subject. I then copied the first essay, as found on page 82, stereotype edition of the Christian Baptist, and forwarded it to said paper for publication, without any signature; noting at its close, "*To be continued.*" Thus I sent six of your essays on the Influence of the Holy Spirit in the Salvation of Men, which were all published. The seventh essay being sent, never made its appearance in that paper. I requested a friend to call on the Editor and inquire the reason why it was suppressed; when he was given to understand that the real author of those essays had been discovered, and consequently he would publish no more of them.

Some time after this I fell in with a friend, who is a Methodist class-leader or steward, of whom I inquired what he thought of those essays. He replied, "I am delighted with them—that is the true Methodist doctrine on the subject of the Spirit. If you *Campbellites* taught thus, I would think you would get to heaven."

I then asked him what he would say were I to tell him that those essays were pure Campbellism—having emanated from the pen of Alexander Campbell of Bethany, Virginia.

He replied, "I would not believe you; for I know that Alexander Campbell teaches entirely different—he denies the influence of the Spirit of God."

I rejoined, "Well, I assure you those essays were written by Alexander Campbell."

He answered, "If they were, he has changed his ground, and does not teach now as he did ten years ago."

I replied, "I assure you that he taught then as he does now, and that his views were expressed in those essays, for I had copied them from the 2d volume of the Christian Baptist, published by Alexander Campbell in 1824, and sent them to the Editor of your paper without letting him know who was the author, and he published until he discovered the author, and then he ceased."

He replied, "I cannot believe it," and left me.

I have given you a plain and brief narrative. If you think it is worthy of a place in your paper, please publish it with such remarks as you may think necessary, and oblige yours, A.

MILLENNIAL CHARACTER OF THE HARBINGER.

We have often rather jeeringly been asked, "Wherein consists the *millennial* characteristics of the Harbinger?"—the querists imagining that a *millennial harbinger* must be always discussing or preaching millenniary affairs. When we put to sea under this banner we had the port of Primitive Christianity, in letter and spirit, in profession and practice, in our eye; reasoning that all the Millennium we could scripturally expect was not merely the restoration of the Jerusalem church in all its moral and religious characters, but the extension of it through all nations and languages for one thousand years. To prepare the way for such a development of Christianity several things are essential—

1st. The annihilation of partyism.

2d. The restoration of a pure speech.

3d. The preaching of the original gospel.

4th. The restoration of the Christian ordinances.

5th. Larger measures of the Holy Spirit, as promised to those who seek for it in the appointed way.

To these five points, as means of the triumph of the gospel over idolatry, infidelity, impiety, immorality, and corrupt religion, we have for years been directing the inquiries of our readers. But we have not committed ourselves to any of the theories of the present day on

the nature and coming of the Millennium. We have, indeed, opened our pages to brother M'Korkle and the Reformed Clergyman, and we have given various extracts and some views of the two systems of interpretation; but we have not gone spiritedly, nor learnedly, nor exclusively into the arena of controversy on this subject—for three reasons—

1st. We wanted the full assurance of understanding the prophecies necessary to our taking a decided stand.

2d. We feared the identification of any theory of the Millennium—as much as any theory of physics or of metaphysics—with the great principles which must leaven society before any great or useful moral change could be expected; judging that if we missed, or were supposed to have missed the mark, either in a millennial theory or in any prominent interpretation of prophecy, it would be used by our vigilant and assiduous opponents against the whole burthen of our lives. Our generous enemies would put down every item of reformation for which we contend, by affirming that it was a part of a theory of prophecy, or of a millennial church, &c. &c. should we have given them any chance by any mistake or error on that subject. On this account I have always doubted the prudence of those brethren who either preached or wrote much on the subject.

3d. We had more pressing and important matter on hand.

But we have not been all this time negligent of the matter, nor inattentive to what is passing in the world on the second coming of the Messiah, the Prophets, and the Millennium. We have read, reflected, and conversed a good deal on these themes, and now think it due to our readers, to the controversy now pending on the question of the second coming of the Messiah, that we should, in our own proper editorial character, deliver some essays on these themes in our next volume. Millenniary affairs, and the general subject of unfulfilled prophecy, will, in our next volume, command a little more of our attention. We may now dive a little into the future without the jeopardy of any principle of moral and religious truth for which we have been laboring for some years. A. C.

News from the Churches.

Charlottesville, Virginia, October 7, 1840.

I have just returned after an absence of two months, a part of the time spent with brother Bullard, laboring among his mountain folks with some success. I think if he should be spared, the cause will be established in those valleys of the south-west. Brother Henshall has just left this county, in which he held several meetings with brother Goss at Free Union and Maupin's meeting-houses. Fourteen persons were immersed. Brother Goss accompanied him to Richmond, and preached there last Lord's day.

R. L. COLEMAN.

SWEET HOME, *Indiana*, July 3, 1840.

I WRITE you in the capacity of a messenger or agent of all the congregations in Elk Heart and St. Joseph counties, and the two adjoining counties of Michigan. A co-operation meeting of these was held on the 28th ult. in St. Joseph county, to adopt some plan for the more extensive proclamation of the good word of the Lord in these regions. But one spirit pervaded the assembly. *Perfect* harmony—*perfect* unanimity characterized all our proceedings. Blessed be the name of the Lord!

1. *Resolved*, That we are abundantly able and willing to support one evangelist constantly in the field.

2. *Resolved*, That we will endeavor to obtain one immediately.

3. *Resolved*, That brother Martin be appointed to procure a suitable person for an evangelist.

4. *Resolved*, That the brethren present [scarcely an individual of all the churches being absent] solemnly pledge themselves in the name of the Lord to contribute their proportions respectively, according to an *advalorem* assessment of their property, if necessary, for the support of an evangelist.

5. *Resolved*, That the object of this effort is not our own advantage, but the salvation of our neighbors.

6. *Resolved*, That we will in no case call upon the aliens to assist us in this work by their contributions

7. *Resolved*, That the success of our evangelist will materially depend upon our living "soberly, righteously, and godly in the world," and upon our weekly exhibitions of the ordinances in the congregations.

A parting song was sung—saluted one another with a holy kiss—parted hoping to meet again. It was a joyful meeting. Seventy broke the loaf on Lord's day. Thirteen were immersed during the meeting, which commenced on Friday and closed first day afternoon. Judging from appearances, a deep impression was made upon a large assembly. We expect a harvest.

There was also held at Beardlej 's, Michigan, a three days' meeting, including the third Lord's day of May last; which, on some accounts (not room to mention them) was the most interesting I ever attended. Four were immersed.

Present at these two meetings all the public teachers we have—viz. Reuben Wilson, John Martindale, and myself. But I am wandering from the subject.

It has devolved on me to procure an evangelist, if possible; the *modus operandi* being discretionary. Will you publish something in the Harbinger on the subject, and repeat it till some one replies, '*Here am I—send me!*' And the word of a Christian for it, should he come with your recommendation and the recommendation of some congregation of your acquaintance, and should the congregation calling fail to come up to their pesuniary pledge *fully* for two years, if I live so long I will deed him in *fee simple*, as a substitute for what may be lacking, 80 acres of good land in Elk Heart county, Indiana. Behold I set my hand to this pledge. Lay it up for a testimony. CORBLY MARTIN.

☞ I can endorse for brother Corbly Martin. He is an old acquaintance, and good for the full amount of his promise. Who will go up to plead the cause of eternal truth? I am sorry this letter has been so long coming to hand. If the brethren are supplied, they will of course inform me. A. C.

Frankfort, Pike county, Missouri, October 10, 1840.

On Friday, the 18th September, our annual meeting commenced in Louisville, Lincoln county, and continued until Tuesday. Three additions were made—two of them were Mormons. Two others confessed on the following Monday. On the following Friday a three days' meeting commenced at Ramsay's creek, Pike county, where six others confessed the Lord and were immersed into his death. Either verbal or written communications were received from the following churches:—

Ramsay's creek, Pike county,	90
Frankfort, do.	88
Louisiana, do.	20
Salt River, Ralls county,	58
New London, do.	30
Sugar Creek, do.	20
Louisville, Lincoln county,	58
Troy, do.	40

About four weeks ago there were thirty-seven added to the church at Houston, Marion county. THOMAS PITT,

Washington, Pennsylvania, October 28, 1840.

It affords me pleasure to communicate to you the pleasing intelligence that last night we terminated a protracted meeting, which commenced on Friday evening. During the continuance of the meeting, notwithstanding the political excitement, the order was good and the attention the best that I ever have witnessed in our house. The result was the conversion of four persons. The preacher was brother Ward principally, assisted on the Lord's day by brother Smith, and on some of the other days by some of the brethren. I will just add that brother Ward, at brother Shrontz', some three months ago, baptized seven, four of whom have united with our church. HENRY LANGLY.

Green Bush, Warren county, Illinois, September 28, 1840.

I will relate to you the success which attended the truth at a protracted meeting which I attended north of this, in Stephenson county, in this state, commencing the Friday before the second Lord's day in September, and continuing till the Wednesday following.

I found a small congregation of disciples there, constituted some time in the past summer. I labored hard and alone during the meeting, sometimes speaking four times per day; the result of which was, twenty-two additions—twenty by immersion, and two who had backslidden. Thus you see the ancient gospel, when presented in its primitive simplicity, is still, as anciently, possessed of virtue and power sufficient to convert the world. The prospects for further additions there is more flattering than at any other place with which I am acquainted. The brethren have made arrangements for me to settle with them and ride as an evangelist, which I have concluded to do.

HENRY HOWE.

La Fayette Seminary, Kentucky, September 21, 1840.

Brother Creath, Jr. has informed me that he is preaching and baptizing largely. Not long since he informed me that he had just immersed the Governess of Illinois. The field of his operations is very large—larger and more promising prospects appear to be upon him than he has ever had. He writes me he is sometimes in Missouri, and then in Illinois; and in his last letter he stated he was on the eve of starting to Iowa. Again he stated that he had just returned from Palmyra, Mo., one of the forts of the old Jew, I believe, where some thirty united themselves to the church of Christ. I presume that brother Creath is now preaching more, and doing more good than he has for years. May Heaven bless and prosper all his laudable efforts, and may he, under the banner of the great King, greatly enlarge the border of Zion!

BEVERLY A. HICKS.

Minerva, Ohio, October 22, 1840.

I would just give you a line to let you know that we are all alive, and have been doing some good since I saw you at your house. Brother John Whitacre and I held a meeting in Hanover, Columbiana county, and immersed thirty-one persons. We commenced on Friday evening last, and continued until Wednesday evening. We had a very good hearing; the people were willing to hear the old-fashioned doctrine of Galilee, and obey.

J. H. JONES.

Near Sharon, Pennsylvania, October 27, 1840.

With thankfulness to the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, I hasten to inform you that in accordance with an arrangement in Warren at the last annual meeting, we obtained the consent of our much esteemed brother Amos Alerton to visit us. According to appointment, our meeting commenced on Friday the 23d instant, and continued until Tuesday late at night. His labors were incessant and profitable. He had no aid in public addresses, with the exception of brother Bushnell, from Hartford, who gave us his services which were duly appreciated by the brethren. The result of the exhibitions of the truth was the removal of much prejudice, and thirteen presented themselves for induction into the kingdom, with one from the Old Baptists and one from the Methodists, who were both formerly immersed. We become more convinced that the Lord designs to be glorified through no other medium than those of his own appointments. Vain, indeed, is all our wisdom in devising associations of various descriptions to ameliorate the state of human society independent of the plan which Infinite Wisdom has adopted. The church of Jesus Christ is that city set on a hill, which will be the grand renovator of our guilty world. With a faithful attendance on all her institutions, and a faithful proclamation of the gospel by able men, although to the world foolishness, yet is the wisdom of God. Therefore we should pray earnestly that the Lord of the harvest would qualify and send forth laborers; for the harvest is plenteous and the laborers are few. I am not without hope that if we could obtain such men as brother Alerton to labor some time in this region, much good might be done. My prayer is that the King may bless you and all that labor in the good cause!

THOMAS HAZELTON.

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, October 16, 1840.

In reference to the success of the good cause here, I have only to say that we have every thing to contend against. The prejudices, you know, are all against us; but we have respectable audiences, and have added since July some 18 or 19; and having concluded to remain until Spring, expect yet to see many more obey the ancient gospel. The brethren and sisters are industrious and united in the good work. May the good Lord help us onward!

G. W. ELLY.

☞ Brother Elly's communication is laid over for next number.

Lexington, Missouri, October 9, 1840.

The church in Richmond is in a flourishing condition. Practical Christianity, as well as a correct theory, is their motto. But, alas! how often do we find the latter without the former! I immersed 3 my last visit. I have just made an excursion through Caldwell and Davis counties, where, if I have been rightly informed, the ancient gospel, stripped of tradition, has never before been preached. These counties were first mostly settled by Mormons. During my visit 2 persons made the good confession; but as it did not include the Baptist experience, the parents of one of them forbid the immersion. The cause in this part of the country is gaining ground rapidly.

T. N. GAINES.

Georgetown, Kentucky, October 17, 1840.

We have just closed a most interesting meeting in this place, of seven days. Brethren Gano and Pinkerton were the speakers. We gained 25 additions, besides restoring some who had for a time wandered off. It was one of the best meetings we have ever had in this place. The good that may result from this meeting is incalculable. We will endeavor to be humble, faithful, and diligent, so as to profit by it. The recent meetings in this town and the vicinity have resulted in upwards of 60 accessions.

Brethren Pinkerton, Scott, and myself had just closed a meeting of twelve days, at Nicholasville and Providence, at which 53 accessions were made to the good cause. Oh! it was a most joyful time!!

Brother A. Kendrick commenced a meeting at the same time in Lexington, which is still in progress. He has been occasionally sustained by others. The success there is beyond all calculation. They have never had such a time in Lexington. Upwards of 100 (I suppose 120) have been gained over to the good cause; and the prospects are as bright as ever according to all accounts. Praised be the name of the Lord!

What a noble society might be formed in Lexington! If Christians would make their happiness depend on their own society, and then exert themselves for the salvation of others, the cause would soon bear down all opposition. But Christianity must languish while professors court the pleasures and honors of the world.

JOHN T. JOHNSON.

Greensburg, Decatur county, Indiana, October 16, 1840.

There is in this county four churches, or congregations, and about 300 members—about 125 of that number added within the last year. There have been about 70 additions to the church in this place in the last ten months—45 by immersion. I have immersed about 126 since about the middle of January last—among others, my son, who was attending the medical lectures in Cincinnati at the time of your visit to that place last winter, which, as you may suppose, is a great cause of rejoicing to his parents, as well as to others of his acquaintance. There is nothing wanting but for all the brethren to do their duty, and the truth will prevail.

J. B. NEW,

Williamsville, New York, October 18, 1840.

I have a somewhat interesting circumstance to communicate to you, and through your paper to the brethren:—Last Friday evening a young lady (a Miss Smith) called at my house, having come from Rutland in Vermont, a distance of 450 miles, for the express purpose of obeying the Lord according to his ancient appointment. Some three or four years ago she became apprized of the fact that there were some disciples in this vicinity, but knew of none at any nearer point until her arrival here. This is the reason assigned for coming to this place. I had the pleasure of introducing her into the Saviour's kingdom yesterday.

How happy would be the results if such an earnest desire to do the will of the Lord should become general!

A. P. JONES.

Warren county, Illinois, August 28, 1840.

Since I last wrote you I have witnessed the submission of some 22 or 23 to the Lord Jesus, in this and an adjoining county.

LIVY HATCHITT.

STATISTICS.

By the *Chronicle of the Church* we learn that the number of communicants in the Protestant Episcopal Church, in 1840, in Connecticut, is 5,000; in Massachusetts, 3,016; Ohio, 1,704; South Carolina, 2,740, Virginia, 3,345; Maryland, 3,992; New Jersey, 1,542; in Western New York, in 1839, 3,189. *Baptist Banner.*

STARTING CHILDREN IN THE WORLD.

"MANY an unwise parent labors hard, and lives sparingly all his life, for the purpose of leaving enough to give his children 'a start in the world,' as it is called. Setting a young man afloat with money left him by his relatives, is like tying bladders under the arms of one who cannot swim: ten chances to one he will lose his bladders and go to the bottom. Teach him to swim, and he will never need the bladders. Give your child a *sound education*, and you have done enough for him. See, too, that *his morals are pure*, his mind cultivated, and his whole nature made subservient to the laws which govern men, and you have given him what will be of more value than all the wealth of the Indies. You have given him a start which no misfortune can deprive him of. The earlier you teach him to depend on his own resources, the better."

CONTRAST BETWEEN THE NILE AND MISSISSIPPI.

THE following is the conclusion of an elegant sketch from the pen of the late learned savan and traveller, Dr. Nutt, of Rodney, Mississippi:—

"The vale of the Nile, so long the admiration of the traveller, is deserving of praise, both for the fertility of its soil and the absence of frost. It is formed entirely of the deposition of the river, which carries within its bosom one-fifth of the earthy matter found in the waters of the Mississippi, and is more fertile than this river, but less so than Red River of Louisiana. When the river is rising, and even until it returns within its banks, the water has a very dark color, which it exchanges for a light red after a fall of ten or fifteen feet. The blackness of the water and soil seems to be communicated from the decomposition of basalt. This we infer, from finding the basalt to underlay the red granite at the first cataract, and the sandstone of the second cataract, and may constitute a great part of the mountains of Abyssinia.

Egypt, in an agricultural point of view, is peculiarly situated. While all the regions of the Mediterranean are favored with rains during the winter and spring seasons—plenty, the result of moderate and repeated rains, and famine, the offspring of excess or deficiency of rain—Egypt is a country of perpetual growth—a country where rain never falls and where cultivation entirely depends upon the waters of the Nile. Nor is the Nile more certain to arrive at the convenient and happy point of elevation than the Mediterranean regions to be attended by moderate and timely rains. The Nile is not subjected to the same extremes of elevation as the waters of the Mississippi, but a double fatality attends it, in rising too high or not high enough—for, in either case, a famine follows. If so high as to pass freely over the banks, the summer and fall crops will be lost; and if not sufficiently high to cover or soften the land in the rear, not only are the farmers unable to irrigate the first crop, consisting of cane, rice, cotton, flax, beans, and dura or guinea corn, but are unable to procure water to soften the back lands by which to soften the wheat and barley crops.

The Nile, like the Mississippi, has its limited region for the growth of the cotton plant. While the valley of the Nile contains three degrees of latitude more profitable for cultivation, the product is one-fifth in quantity of that of Mississippi. The difference in quantity to the acre, is in part owing to the high water which occurs at an unfavorable period—a time when the cotton bolls are more rapidly forming than at any other time of the annual growth, and when the tap-root having descended fifteen feet, suffers decay from being soaked in the water. The fibre is long and silky, possessing a like number of nodules, and is often found to partake of the cream or orange color, which it acquires from a union of the oil and alkali of the fibre. This occurrence is less frequent with the cotton of the Mississippi, on account of too much dampness of the climate—but where it does exist, can be detected by entering a gin cotton room at night, as it fails not to impart the smell of soap. The cotton of Syria, Palestine, and Asia Minor is without this color; the fibre is short and less fine, and the product to the acre is about one-eighth of that of the cotton regions of Mississippi. Such a difference in the quantity and quality of the

cotton may proceed from too much dryness of the growing period, and the coolness of the spring and fall seasons. Thus it appears that in all countries where the summers are without rain, and the atmosphere as dry as in those of the countries above mentioned, the cotton plant cannot be very profitably cultivated.

We are inclined to think that all the cotton regions of South America, as well as those of Asia and Africa, are accompanied by such circumstances; or, as in the East Indies and Mexico, attended with too much rain during the growing season. Hence the conclusion is, that the cotton plant is most profitably cultivated in the United States—and that considering the continued waning of the people of all other cotton countries, the article for centuries will continue to be the most profitable cultivated of all the products of the American states.

The Nile, unlike all rivers known to us, divides a desert of two thousand miles in extent, consisting of frightful plains of shifting sands, and mountains of lofty and precipitous rock, where rain never falls and vegetation can never exist. Amidst these dreary abodes of perpetual silence a majestic river flows from south to north, and like the Mississippi and Red River, ever bearing to the eastward, and ever wearing the cliffs off that side. This river consists of a volume of water about four hundred yards wider than the Mississippi, with less than half its depth, and nearly one-third less in velocity. The Nile, like the Mississippi, has its oceanic lakes. Their configuration distinguishes them from those formed by the cut-off. They are traced one hundred and eighty miles up the river, lake Meris being the highest; while on the vale of the Mississippi detached portions of the Gulf of Mexico are detected four hundred miles above its mouth.

The vale of the Nile, for one thousand miles in extent, may average fifteen miles in width—while the Mississippi, for the same distance, will average forty miles. The Nile appears to contain two-thirds more arable land than the Mississippi, and when we take into consideration all the circumstances of the two rivers, we are constrained to allow to the Nile a term of years vastly greater since the alluvia land has been in a state of accumulation."

THE FOUR VISIONS OF DANIEL.

DANIEL VII. 2.

An article in the Literalist, entitled, "A Brief Inquiry into the Prospect of the Church of Christ," written by the Hon. Gerard T. Noel, A. M., contains the following fervent eulogy on the nature of the prophecy:—

"These visions bear the bright impression of a divine original. They unfold in a few words the whole outline of the political and moral history of the human race within the confines of the Roman world, from the time of Daniel to the hour of the second advent of Christ. The *first* vision, under the emblem of an *image*, foretells a succession of monarchies, the last of which, when broken into *ten* parts, is smitten to shivers by a stone cut out of the mountain. The *second* vision foretells the same succession of four monarchies; the division of the last ten into powers, under the emblem of ten horns; and

the existence of an *eleventh* power arising after the former division of ten. The eleventh power subdues three of the ten, and directs his special enmity against the saints of God, until at length these persecuted saints themselves receive the kingdom, and reign with *him* to whom the Ancient of Days hath assigned an everlasting dominion. These prophecies no human hand could have traced, because no human mind could have thus pierced through the dark and interfolded veils of futurity. The Omniscient and the Almighty alone could have thrown back those folds, and have exhibited the successive events which they concealed. Let any man compare with these visions the history of the world during the last two thousand three hundred years, and let him stand astonished before the wisdom and the strength of a captive of Judah, a youthful stranger in a foreign land! A ray from the Eternal Throne illuminated his mind; the visions of the Omniscient made him wise. The record still lives upon the mysterious page; and while two thousand years of conflict and of crime have rolled their destructive waves over the deep-wrought characters, they remain imperishable; to the eye of faith still brilliant as the burning flame!"

How impressively do these remarks enforce the propriety and importance of the study of prophecy! It gives the best and most available arrangement of history; enables us to classify the mass of events; and illustrates, as no other can, the presence of supreme omniscience in controlling the whole. "Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty! Just and true are thy ways, thou King of Saints!"

New York Evangelist.

EDUCATION OF PLANTS.

"INNUMERABLE are the advantages which mankind have derived from the horticulturists. Few would suppose that the peach (from which branched the nectarine) had its origin in the wild lime. That favorite edible, celery, springs from a rank acid root denominated smallage, which grows in all sides of ditches, and in the neighborhood of the sea. The hazlenut was the ancestor of the filbert and cubnut; while the luscious plum can claim no higher source than the sloe. From the sonac crab issues the golden pippin; and the pear and cherry originally grew in the forest. The garden asparagus, which grows, though not very commonly, in stony and gravelly situations near the sea, when growing spontaneously is a diminutive plant; and none, indeed, but a practised eye, examining into the species which is reared by artificial culture, can discern the least resemblance. Wondrous to relate, the cauliflower, of which the broccoli is a sub-variety, is derived, together with the cabbage, from the colewort; a small plant in its natural state, with scanty leaves, not weighing half an ounce. The Crambe Maratima, which is found wild adjacent to the sea, has been improved into sea-kale. The invaluable potato is the offspring of a bitter American root, of spontaneous growth; and the all-tempting pine-apple descends from a fruit which in foreign climates grows wild by the side of rivulets, and under the shade of lofty trees.

Gardener's Gazette.

TESTIMONY OF THE MATERIAL WORLD.

We take the following extract from the commencement of the "The Witnessing Church," by the Rev. John Harris, D. D.—*Cross & Journal.*

THERE is one important respect in which all objects in the universe, from the atom to the arch-angel, unite—all are witnesses for God. He who made all things for himself, has so made them, that, voluntarily or involuntarily, according to their respective natures, they distinctly attest the divine existence and character. He has not left it contingent whether they give such testimony or not. The great name of the Maker is inwoven into the texture of every thing he has made. So that even if the creature possess a will, and that will become depraved, and guiltily withhold its intelligent testimony to the divine existence, an eloquent and incorruptible witness is still to be found in the physical constitution of that creature; if the fool should say in his heart, 'There is no God,' every atom of that vital organ adds, 'He is thy Maker.'

As the natures of the material witnesses differ, it follows of course that the manner in which they render their evidence will vary accordingly. In regard to some of them, the marks of design and beneficence are so obvious that they may be said to be ever speaking for God, without solicitation: the divine signature is visibly imprinted on their surface. In regard to others, the evidence lies deeper, and must be sought for patiently. In such cases, while the witnesses are under examination, while the investigation is proceeding from link to link in the chain of evidence, the ungodly sometimes unseasonably exult, and the timid and uninformed believer in revelation trembles for the issue. But he need not. Let him only wait confidently, as God does till the examination be complete, till the inquiry has reached the last link of the chain, and that link will invariably be found in the hand of God.

Chemistry, once the strong hold of the sceptic, has long since discovered that no substance in nature is simple and unmixed; in other words, that every thing is in a *made* state—that even the atom is an artificial, manufactured thing; so that an argument for God lies in every particle of which the globe is composed; and a witness is in reserve in every pebble we pass; and a final appeal is lodged for him in the elements, or first principles of all things: thus demolishing the altar which scepticism had erected to the eternity of the world, and replacing it by an altar inscribed to the Divine Creator. So that, if we hold our peace, or withhold our homage, the very stones will cry out.

Geology, the voice of the earth, the Pompeii of natural religion, the witness raised from the grave of a former world, is producing her primitive formations to show that even *they* are in a *made* state, and her fossil skeletons, to show that they bear indubitable marks of having come from the hand of the one Great Designer; leaving us to infer, that, could we reach the foundation of the earth, we should find it inscribed with the name of the Divine Architect—that, could we penetrate to the central atom of the globe, it would speak for God; and thus impelling us to erect, out of the wreck of a former world, a temple to him who hath created all new things.

Astronomy leads us forth into the vast amphitheatre of nature, to gaze on ten thousand times ten thousand burning worlds; and are they not all witnesses for God? For are they not all in *motion*? This is

not nature, but miracle. The first miracle was the production of matter; the second to make that matter move. Its natural state is rest; but here are unnumbered myriads of material worlds in motion, out of their natural state, in an artificial, constrained, preternatural state.—They are all God's witnesses.

The stars in their courses fight against irreligion. Each of them obediently followed, is a star of Bethlehem—a guide into the divine presence. Each of them rushes through immensity as a miracle and a messenger from God to the universe, proclaiming, 'There is a God, and the hand of God is upon me;' and all of them unite—yes, this is the real music of the spheres, the chorus of creation!—all of them unite in proclaiming his eternal power and godhead. In the estimation of the Psalmist, the creation is a vast temple, and often did he summon the creatures and join them in a universal song of praise. And John heard the chorus. The noise and din of a distracted world may drown their voices here; 'But,' saith he, 'every creature which in heaven and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them heard I, saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb forever.' Thus nature, with all her myriad voices, is ever making affirmation and oath of the divine existence, and filling the universe with the echo of his praise.

UNIVERSALISTS.

Sixty-six Universalist Societies have suspended the regular maintenance of preaching, or have become defunct, in the New England states since 1830. Twenty-five ministers have left the Universal ministry within the last six years. Now these facts do not, in our opinion, necessarily prove that the doctrine of universal salvation has not as many adherents as formerly. They may only prove that, either from the selfishness this doctrine engenders, or from the obvious inutility of preaching it, even if true, its adherents are unwilling, or think themselves unable, to maintain the outward forms of public worship. *Cross and Journal.*

TRUE BAPTISM.

Brother, are you a husband and the head of a family? Do you daily and constantly read the scriptures and pray in your family? Do you bring up your children in the correction, instruction, and admonition of the Lord? Are you spiritually-minded, and rejoicing in hope of the glory of God? Do you often meditate, and carefully examine yourself? Have you your behaviour without covetousness, and are you intent on making your calling and election sure? If so, baptism verily profiteth you: if not, it is no better than baby sprinkling. A. C.

OBITUARY.

DEPARTED this life on the 28th October, at Vevay, Indiana, JOHN LATHAM, of Springfield, Illinois, aged 28 years. This truly excellent and devoted brother was so intent on knowing, doing, and teaching his Master's will, that, for the time being, he literally abandoned his beloved relatives and pleasant home, in one of the richest locations in that luxuriant state, and almost a year since came, with his sister wife and two children, to our vicinity, a land journey of 600 miles, for no other purpose than to improve himself in sacred literature and biblical studies. He had lately visited his relatives, and was returning to Bethany, when at Vevay he was taken of the prevailing epidemic, and, after a severe illness of a few days, borne with Christian patience and perfect acquiescence, he cheerfully resigned his spirit in the blessed hope of the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ. A good man, and an exemplary Christian of much promise, has fallen in Israel. May the Lord be a husband to his bereaved and amiable wife, and a father to his infant children!

It is our painful duty to announce the death of brother DAVID ESTEP, one of the deacons of the Alleghenny church, Pittsburg. After a short illness, he expired on Wednesday the 28th October. The particulars of his latter end we have not heard, farther than that he declared his readiness to depart and be with Christ, whom he loved above all earthly relations. A. C.

PSALMODY.

ESSAYS ON PSALMODY, deferred for more than a year past, shall appear in our next volume. This is a subject which, taken in its whole latitude and importance, is not duly considered by many of the Christian community. We had long desired to invite the attention of our readers to the subject.

☞ Our brother Stone's fourth essay on the Atonement was received just at the close of this number, and must lay over to the next.

BEWARE OF JOHN P. HUNT!

THE undersigned, Elders of the Church of Christ at Leesburg, by and with the concurrence of the Church, take this method of cautioning the public generally against a certain base individual, named *John P. Hunt*, formerly a member of this congregation, but in consequence of immoral, dishonest conduct, the abandonment of his wife and helpless little daughters, and an extensive fraud practised on the community, has been thrown beyond the pale of Christian fellowship, and indeed almost of public charity. That he may not again impose on an unsuspecting community, or on some innocent female, we caution them to be on their guard. Said Hunt is by trade a gun-smith and black-smith, about 40 years of age, 5 feet 9 inches high, dark complexion, black eyes or dark colored, black hair, round shouldered, spare features, of genteel manners, quite grave, yet fond of changes. He has lately been seen at ——, Missouri, with abundant supplies, while his family are here in want. It has only been about two years since he imposed himself upon us. His previous life, we are informed, has been quite a rambling one.

JAMES A. McHATTAN,
PASKEL KIRTLEY,
WILLIAM McMILLEN,
JOSEPH WASSON.

LEESBURG, Harrison county, Ky. July, 1840.

N. B Will Editors, either religious or political, please publish the above for the good of society, and to check, if possible, the career of this dangerous man!

From Blackwood's Magazine.

HOME IN THE SKIES.

When up to nightly skies we gaze,
Where stars pursue their endless ways,
We think we see from earth's low clod
The wide and shining home of God.

But could we rise to moon or sun,
Or path where planets duly run,
Still heaven would spread above us far,
And earth remote would seem a star.

'Tis vain to dream those tracts of space,
With all their worlds, approach his face;
One glory fills each rolling ball—
One love has shaped and moved them all.

This earth, with all its dust and tears,
Is his no less his than yonder spheres;
And rain-drops weak, and grains of sand,
Are stamped by his immediate hand.

The rock, the wave, the little flower,
All fed by streams of living power,
That spring from one Almighty Will,
Whate'er his thoughts conceive, fulfil.

And is this all that man can claim?
Is this our longing's final aim?
To be like all things round—no more
Than pebbles cast on Time's grey shore?

Can man, no more than beast, aspire
To know his being's awful Sire?
And, born and lost on Nature's breast,
No blessing seek but there to rest?

Not this our doom, thou God benign!
Whose rays on us unclouded shine:
Thy breath sustains yon fiery dome,
But Man is meet thy favored home.

We view those halls of painted air,
And own thy presence makes them fair;
But dearer still to thee, O Lord!
Is he whose thoughts to thine accord.

THE LOVE OF GOD.

Could I with ink the ocean fill,
Were the whole world of parchment made,
Was every single stick a quill,
And every man a scribe by trade—
To write the love of God would drain the ocean dry,
Nor could the scroll contain the whole, though spread from sky to sky.

Anonymous.

A HINT.

☞ Many Agents and Subscribers are in arrears to us from one to ten years. The consequence is, *we* are now in arrears to others.—A word to the wise, and a hint to the honest and noble, is more than enough.

A. C.

INDEX.

Abbott Orrin, Reply to, - - - - 427
Acts xi. 26., Remarks on, - - - - 367
Address on the Amelioration of the Social State, - 304
" to the Baptists on Union, - - - 481
" extracts from—on Common School Education, - 329
" from Ephesus to the Apostle Paul, - - 251
Administration of Ordinances, - - - - 504
Advantages of the Press, - - - - 435
Annual State Meetings, - - - - 189
" Meeting at Springfield, Illinois, - - 384
Appeal to the Brethren, - - - - 186
Appeals from the Decision of a Congregation, - - 501
Apostolic Age of the Church, - - - - 80
Atonement—by Barton W. Stone, - 243, 289, 387, 464
" by A. Campbell, - - 246, 294, 391, 471

Bacon College, - - - - - - 425
Baltimore—a New Church in, - - - - 513
Baptism, - - - - - 197, 211
Baptism, True, - - - - - - 570
Baptism, Methodist, - - - - - 545
Bethel, or the Christian's House, - - - - 5
Bethany College, - 48, 60, 130, 155, 176, 219, 508
" " first Donation to, - - 179
Bishop Purcell's Visit to Rome, - - - 93
Blue Stockings, - - - - - 143
Book of Jasher, - - - - - 419
Breast the Wave, Christian, - - - - 432
Broaddus, Mr., Letter from, - - - - 554
Mr. Campbell's Response to, - - - 557
Brethren in Kentucky, Notice to the, - - - 144

Character (millennial) of the Harbinger, - - - 561
Charter of Bethany College, - - - - 176
Charge, a heavy, - - - - - 287
Charlottesville, Meeting at, - - - - 379
Children, starting in the World, - - - 565
Christian's House, or Bethels, - - - - 5
Christians among the Sects, - 106, 125, 127, 162, 275
Christian Messenger, - - - - - 480
" Morality, - 97, 208, 233, 272, 413
" Publisher, - - - - - 95
Christianos, Strictures on, - - - - 125
" Remarks on, by A. C., - - - 127
Church in Baltimore, a New, - - - - 513
" Difficulties, - - - - 33, 128, 216
" Edification, - - - - - 56
College at Bethany, - 48, 60, 130, 155, 176, 179, 508
College at Harrodsburg, - - - - - 31
Contrast between the Nile and Mississippi, - - - 566

Conversion of the Jews, - - - 142, 299
" a real change, - - - - 16
Conversations at Carleton House, 9, 72, 119, 170, 202, 264, 349, 406 442, 493, 549
Co-operation Meeting, - - - - - 37

Daniel, the Four Visions of, - - - - 567
Deaf and Dumb Asylum, Danville, Ky., - - 32
Debate on Universalism, - - - 144, 432
Definitions and Answers to Questions, - - 81, 134, 136
Difficulties in Churches, - - 33, 128, 216, 433
" by M. Winans, - - - - 478
" of a Sceptic, - - - - 428
Dispensation, End of the present, in 1840, - - 270
Doctrine, a New, - - - - - 279
Donation, the first, to Bethany College, - - 179
Duncan, John M., on Foreknowledge, - - - 486

Earthquake, - - - - - - 143
Edification, Church, - - - - - 56
Education, Family, - - - - - 340
Elegant Extracts, - - - - - 132
Errata, - - - - - - - 384, 528
Error corrected, - - - - - - 95
Estep, David, notice of his death, - - - 571
Evangelist, - - - - - - 285, 415
" Extracts from, - - - - 187
Evangelists, Duty and Means of Supporting, - - 180
Evening Hymn, - - - - - - 144
Evidence, Thoughts on, 42, 89, 145, 169, 332, 385, 459, 462
Excursion, - - - - - - - 30
Extract from a Poem by N. P. Willis, - - 191

Faith Alone, - - - - - - 337, 491
Family Education, - - - - - 340
Family Culture, 9, 72, 119, 170, 202, 264, 349, 406, 442, 493, 549
Feast of Pentecost, - - - - - 168
Female Seminaries, - - - - - 384
Fleming, Leonard J., Notice of his death, - - 431
Foreknowledge, John M. Duncan on, - - - 486
Forgiveness, - - - - - - 144
Forward, Elder Chauncy, Notice of his death, - - 47
Four Pressing Wants, - - - - - 140

Golden Rule, - - - - - - 527
Gospel, a delusive and subtle Heresy, - - - 226

Harbinger, the circulation of, - - - - 46
" Millennial character of, - - - 561
Harney's Algebra, - - - - - 528
Harrodsburg Meeting, - - - - - 383
Heresy, Embryo, - - - - - - 68
Heretic Detector, - - - - - - 528
Heretical Periodicals, - - - - - 69
Home in the Skies, - - - - - - 572

Hubbel, H. S., - - - - - - - 94
Hunt, John P., beware of, - - - - - 570

I go a-fishing, - - - - - - - 85
Infant Baptism not a substitute for Circumcision, - - 426
Institution, a New, - - 48, 60, 130, 155, 176, 219, 508
Is not our Lord's Day the primeval Sabbath? - - 475
Jasher, Book of, - - - - - - 419
Jews, Conversion of the, - - - - - 142, 299
" Love of Judea, - - - - - - 180
" Opinion of Christ, - - - - - 141

Landis, Rev. R. W., - - - 49, 93, 356, 399
Latham, John, notice of his death, - - - 571
Lay hands suddenly on no man, - - - - 70
Letter from Cyrus Bosworth to W. F. M. Arny, - - 66
" W. F. M. Arny to Cyrus Bosworth, - - 88
" to B., a Sceptic, - - - - 52
" to the Disciples called Christians, in the State of Indiana, 277
" from Timothy to Paul, - - - - - 510
Leonard's School, Louisville, - - - - 32
Lindsey, N. L., Notice of his death, - - - 525
Literary Men in Wedlock, - - - - 524
Lisbon, Dreadful condition of Society in, - - 142
Lord's Supper, - - - - - - 201
Luther's Descendants, - - - - - 143

Material World, Testimony of, - - - - 569
Meeting at Charlottesville, Virginia, - - - 379
" at Wellsburg, - - - - - 188
Mercenary Spirit, - - - - - 193
Meredith, Mr., on Remission, - - - - 536
Methodist Baptism, - - - - - 545
Millennial Character of the Harbinger, - - 561
Minutes of the Savannah River Baptist Association, - 235
Morality of Christians, - - 97, 208, 233, 272, 413
Museum, the Young Ladies', - - - - 144

Name, our, - - - - 17, 47, 281, 362, 404
News from the Churches, 38, 98, 137, 182, 228, 277, 335, 380, 421
477, 514, 562
New Doctrine, - - - - - - 79
Note, - - - - - - - 378

Our Course, - - - - - - - 474
Our Dwelling Place, - - - - - - 124
Obituary Notices, - - 47, 94, 189, 384, 431, 525, 571
Orthodoxy, a Sin against, - - - - 529
Our Meetings on the Western Reserve, - - - 478

Paragraph, by Dr. Channing, - - - - 457
Partyism, - - - - - - 66
Passive Obedience and Non-Resistance, - - - 140
Paslay, William L., Notice of his death, - - 426
Pendleton, Philip B., Notice of his death, - - 94

Peters, Dr., and the American Biblical Repository, - 93, 221
Philanthropist, and the Morality of Christians, - - 233
Piety, Early, - - - - - - - 284
Prize Essay, - - - - - - 480
Progress of Reformation among the Baptists, - - 448
Prophetic Calculation, - - - - - 334
Prospectus of the Journal of Christianity, - - 240
Private Correspondence, - - - - - 114, 150
Preface, - - - - - - - 3
Plants, Education of, - - - - - 568
Psalmody, - - - - - - 571
Plymouth Brethren, - - - - - 454
Positive Ordinances, - - - - - 301
Purcell, Bishop, his Visit to Rome, - - - 92

Questions answered, - - - 81, 134, 136, 238

Reading the Scriptures, - - - - - 547
Reflection, - - - - - - 287
Religious Excitement, - - - - - 166
" Statistics of the United States, - - 239
" Experience, - - - - - 282
Remission, Mr. Meredith on, - - - - 536
Revivalism in Scotland, - - - - 165

Scepticism, - - - - - - 52
Scriptures, Reading the, - - - - 547
Scriptural View of Christian Character and Privileges, - 345, 396
Sectarianism is Heresy, - - - - - 254
Self-made Men, - - - - - 287
Sin and its Consequences, - - - - 359
Sin against Orthodoxy, - - - - - 529
Smith, Brother Carey, - - - - - 95
Specimens of Sophistry, - - - - 103, 214
Statistics, - - - - - - 565
Study of Christ crucified, - - - - 142
Supposed Hoax, - - - - - 383
Supremacy of Christ, - - - - - 453

Tamerlane and Faust, - - - - - 457
The four Visions of Daniel, - - - - 567
Thoughts on Evidence, - 42, 89, 145, 169, 332, 385, 459, 462
Tornado at Natchez, - - - - - 458
Triumph of Truth, a Poem by Joshua Marsden, - - 96
True Baptism, - - - - - - 570

Universalism, Debate on, - - - - 144, 432
Universalists, - - - - - - 570

Visions of Daniel, - - - - - 567
Voice from the North on Christianos, - - - 275

War, the Effects of, - - - - - 458
What is Education? - - - - - 430
Wylie, Dr. Andrew, - - - - - 239, 254

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
REFERENCE DEPARTMENT

This book is under no circumstances to be taken from the Building